THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLIII, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1960

CONTENTS

The Covenant and How it Grew
Neal M. Flanagan, O.S.M. 145

Problems of the Lay Apostolate . . . *John Patrick Reid, O.P.* 157

Mary and Culture . . . . . *John L. Murphy* 167

The Moral Virtues in St. Thomas: II
Edward J. McNally, S.J. 173

The Morality of Nuclear Warfare
Theodore J. Zubek, O.F.M. 183

The Church as Mother . . . . . *Vincent F. Blehl, S.J.* 191

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and John P. McCormick, S.S.

Nuptial Blessing 200

Funeral Absolution Problems 200

Solemn Mass Procession 201

Vested Crucifix 201

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Chalice in the Hands of a Deceased Priest 202
The Morality of Ovulation Rebound 203
The Act of Contrition in the Baltimore Catechism 205

BOOK REVIEWS

Jesus Christus, Meditations, *by Romano Guardini* 207
The General Councils of the Church, *by John L. Murphy* ... 208
In the Whole Christ, *by Emile Guerry* 209
Why I am a Catholic, *by Paul van Kuykendall Thomson* ... 211
Anchored in God, *by Constantine Cavarnos* 211
Harvest, 1960, *edited by Dan Herr and Paul Cuneo* 213

BOOKS RECEIVED 215

Reprinted by popular request—

Something for the Parents on Pupils' Home Study

by REVEREND EDWARD P. DUNNE, O.P.

This article was originally published in the November 1958 issue of *The Catholic Educational Review*

16 pages—5½ x 8½

Sample copy	15¢
In lots of 25	12¢ ea.
In lots of 100	10¢ ea.

PRICES POSTPAID

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.

THE COVENANT AND HOW IT GREW

One cannot read through the books of the Old Testament very long without realizing that they contain one concept which takes precedence over all others: it is that of the covenant.[1] The Jews were most keenly aware during their long and eventful history that their birth into political and religious existence was due entirely to the providential care of a loving and just God. Once upon a time, they were not. They existed in no way, shape, or form as a precise people; that they began to exist was God's doing.[2] That they existed in this religious form, with the theology, moral laws, cultic practices it possessed, was, again, God's doing. God had called them into being, formed them, made them His own, and, even more remarkable to contemplate, had declared Himself theirs. These elements all formed integral parts of the divine covenant.

A covenant is, in its broadest description, an "agreement" between two or more persons or parties. The pre-Christian covenant bound together God and Israel as the external expression of Yahweh's election of this people as His own.[3] It can best be seen and

[1] The usual Hebrew word for covenant is *"berith."* A quasi-synonym is *"shalom,"* (peace), which helps to understand the function of covenant. Pedersen notes (*Israel* [Denmark, 1956], I-II, 285): "We see that the *usus loquendi* only distinguishes vaguely between the relation of kin and friendship. Both are called shalom and berith, peace or covenant. These two words are of different origin and scope, but they do not designate different kinds of relationship; *shalom* means the state prevailing in those united: the growth and full harmony of the soul, *berith* the community with all the privileges and duties implied in it. Therefore both words may be used together, a 'covenant of peace' (*Ezek.* 34:25; 37:26) being only a stronger expression for covenant. The two words are often used interchangeably."

[2] The history of the Jews *begins* with the call of Abraham in *Gen.* 12.

[3] Pedersen, *op. cit.*, III-IV, 612: "The most apt expression of the relation between Yahweh and Israel is the covenant, *berith*. This denotes the psychic communion and the common purpose which united the people and its God. It is also expressed by saying that the peace of Yahweh reigns in Israel (*shalom, Jer.* 16:5); therefore the relation between them is characterized by love, the feeling of fellowship among kinsmen. The covenant finds expression in the nature and customs of the people. By observing this *mishpat* Israel maintains the covenant, but a departure from true custom, to which in the first place would belong intercourse with other gods, is a breach of the covenant. Yahweh maintains the covenant by acting as the God of Israel."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

delineated by considering it under its triple state of development: the Mosaic covenant, the Abrahamic, the Davidic.[4]

THE MOSAIC COVENANT

This covenant, or agreement, effected atop a nature-shaken Mt. Sinai as these refugees from Egypt met their God, included four most important components.[5] On the part of God it contained a great PROMISE, that of the *land*. To this people would be given the land of Canaan (*Exod.* 3:8). This would be the material blessing, and a necessary one. As Fr. John McKenzie notes well:

> The patriarchs also felt the pull of the land, and the promise of the land recurs throughout those portions of the Old Testament which tell the stories of the patriarchs and of the Hebrews in Egypt and in the desert.
>
> There is more here than the attraction of the Sown for the nomad. A people is not truly a people, a nation, until it takes root in the soil. Until that time, it is a tribe, one of the innumerable tribes which flit across the deserts of the east, as nomad tribes once flitted across the prairies of North America, leaving nothing but their names in rivers, creeks, mountains, and the cities of the men who wiped them off the map. For the nomad cannot survive against the sturdy peasant; nor can he survive even in his own proper element, the inhospitable desert, for the tribes lack any defense against nature and against each other. They vanish, and other tribes rise to take their place; they have no history, and they contribute nothing to the sum of human experience. Such was the clan of Abraham, "the sons of Israel," and they yearned for the land because the Lord had marked them as His own; until He gave it to them, they remained rootless wanderers, without the stability they needed to meet the destiny which they believed awaited them.[6]

A much greater spiritual blessing was also evidenced. The very STATUS of Israel was changed, ennobled. By becoming the people of Yahweh (*Exod.* 19:5-6; *Lev.* 26:12), His own as distinct from all other peoples of the world, Israel entered into a personal,

[4] That the format of the Mosaic covenant was not novel to the world of Mosaic times has been pointed out in a superb article by George Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *Biblical Archaeologist,* XVII (1954), 50-76. Mendenhall has studied the Hittite covenants which can be dated about 1450-1200 B.C. The Hittites, whose relationship to the Jews is certain (though, perhaps, indirect) because of mutual close contact with Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, practiced a type of covenant between a

a warmly intimate relationship with God analogous to that present between father and son.[7] Israel became the "son of God." God says

"supreme king" and his "vassal kings" which has great similarity to the Mosaic decalogue covenant in *Exodus*, and to that of Josue in *Josue* 24. This covenant Mendenhall titles *suzerainty*, as distinct from the *parity covenant* between strict equals. Its elements and the Mosaic and Josuaic correspondants were as follows:

HITTITE	MOSAIC	JOSUE 24
1. Preamble: name, excellence of great king	*Exod.* 20:12	*Josue* 24:2
2. Historical prologue: description of benevolent acts already performed by great king on behalf of his vassals	*Exod.* 20:2	vv. 2-13; 17-18
3. Stipulations: obligations of vassals, most essential being prohibition of pacts with foreign powers	*Exod.* 20:3-17 *Exod.* 20:22-23, 33	vv. 14-16; 19; 23
4. Provision for deposit of covenant in temple and future reading of it	*Exod.* 40:20	
5. List of gods as witnesses	(impossible)	v. 22: people witness v. 27: stone witnesses
6. Curses and blessings	traditions of *Deut.* 27:4 ff.	v. 20
7. Formal oath by vassal kings	(not in question)	
8. Solemn ceremony	*Exod.* 24:4-8	vv. 26-27

Many of these Hittite elements can also be found apart from *Exodus* and *Josue* 24, but related to them. Thus, for example, we find the tradition of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to Moses: "Then you are to say to Pharaoh, 'Thus say the Lord: Israel is my *firstborn* son; so I say to you, Let my son go . . . (*Exod.* 4:22-23). First-born son of God, what a wonderful history that title was to have!

To these "sons of God" Yahweh gave a LAW, a living law which grew and adapted itself to changing situations down through the centuries, but which remained the expression of the divine will, to which the people were required to bend their own wills and actions. The essential core of this law was the group of *Ten Commandments* (*Exod.* 20:2-17).[8] Given to a people emerging from centuries of captivity beneath pagan Egyptians, these commandments were adapted to a primitive spiritual mentality, to a yet untrained moral sense. Israel—Yahweh's first-born—was, morally speaking, but a child, and was treated as such. The Commandments

---

the renewal of the covenant by Josue (*Josue* 8:30-35) on Mt. Gerizim with its mention of *curses and blessings.* This incident is specifically related (in verse 31) to *Deut.* 27:4 ff., which recounts an instruction given by Moses in which the curses and blessings are mentioned in much greater detail. These passages, too, indicate a tradition concerning a covenant which is very similar to that of the Hittites. Cf. also the related article by Joseph Fitzmeyer, S.J., "The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty from Sefire in the Museum of Beirut," in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* XX (1958), 444-476.

[5] It would be a great mistake to believe that the Jews, because of some theological concept of a covenant, had *imagined* the events of Sinai to portray this concept in the concrete. The truth is just the opposite. The covenant was so all important because it came from the unforgettable experience the Jews had had with Yahweh at Sinai, an experience they had barely survived.

[6] John L. McKenzie, S.J., *The Two-Edged Sword* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956), p. 118.

[7] Pedersen, *op. cit.,* III-IV, 612: "This relation between the people and its God finds expression in many ways. Yahweh is the father of Israel, who has begotten or created the people. Israel is his son, the Israelites are his sons. Israel is called his first-born to express its preferential position.

[8] These Ten Commandments, in their original form, are Mosaic and usually considered more ancient than the other two important sets of laws in *Exodus,* the Book of the Covenant (*Exod.* 20:22-23, 33) and the Ten Words (*Exod.* 34:17-26). Grollenberg (*Atlas of the Bible* [Nelson], p. 56) dates the Ten Words to the period of David and Solomon. He dates the Book of the Covenant to the time shortly before the entry into Canaan. So, too, E. Siegman, C.PP.S.: *AER,* 136 (1957), 169, who quotes Cazelles for the same opinion. Albright's *Stone Age to Christianity* (Doubleday Anchor Book, 1957) says the Book of the Covenant presupposes an organized sedentary society (p. 269).

were all based, consequently, on the most primitive and obvious of virtues, that of justice: justice toward God, justice toward one's neighbor.[9]

So the first three components of the Covenant appeared: the PROMISE of the *land;* the new STATUS of being the *sons of God;* the LAW of *justice* to which the people were bound to comply.

To seal this agreement between God and man, BLOOD was shed. The Bible says:

> Then he sent the young men of the Israelites to offer burnt-offerings and to sacrifice oxen as thank-offerings to the Lord, while Moses himself took half of the blood, and put it in basins, dashing the other half on the altar. He then took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people, who said, "All that the Lord has directed we will obediently do." Then Moses took the blood and dashed it on the people, saying, BEHOLD THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT which the Lord has made with you on the basis of all these regulations (*Exod.* 24:5-8).

This blood, half of it spilt on the altar representing God, the other half on the people, was similar to a present-day exchange of signatures legalizing a document. With this blood the covenant was signed by both parties. Yahweh became Israel's God; Israel became His people, His first-born son. God promised His people land and blessings; they promised Him obedience. The blood of Israel's future sacrifices was a memorial to this first covenant spilling.

This Mosaic covenant was THE covenant of O.T. times, a formal agreement which molded the Israelites into a religious form which is still theirs 3000 years later. The annual celebration of the Paschal Feast down through the centuries had kept the covenant a living reality in the people's heart. Each year the Paschal liturgy saw them standing at table as men ready for a journey, sandals on their feet, staff in hand, garments tucked up, eating the paschal lamb with herbs of bitterness and unleavened bread. The renewal of this liturgy was the annual profession of faith in the mighty and loving God Who had brought His people out of bondage into the land He had promised Abraham and his seed.

[9] It should be noted that the form of these Commandments, their apodictic imperative, demanded an individual and personal response from the Israelites. In this sense, Yahwism was individualistic long before the period of Jeremias and Ezechiel. For the Jewish originality in forming such apodictic laws, cf. Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

As the people became a nation, settling down into the country of the dislodged Canaanites, as they became interested in their past history and the complete story of how they came to be, they realized that this covenant which had been given to the people through Moses as mediator also had an embryonic pre-Mosaic chapter. As far back as the people could go in their family history, as far back as Abraham (*Deut.* 26:5-10), God had initiated a covenant. We call it the Abrahamic covenant.[10]

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

This, too, was an agreement between God and the unique personal beginning of God's people. This people was to rise from the seed of Abraham:

> "Leave your land, your relatives, and your father's home," says God, "for the land that I will show you; and I will make a great nation of you; I will bless you, and make your name so great that it will be used for blessings. I will bless those who bless you, and anyone who curses you I will curse; through you shall all the families of the earth invoke blessings on one another" (*Gen.* 12:1-3).[11]

So the covenant between God and Abraham is the initiation of that between God and Israel. For the Israelites this point was the beginning of the history of salvation.[12] This covenant is not nearly so formal an exchange as that of Mt. Sinai, but some of the same elements are clearly visible. To Abraham, too, God gives PROMISES, *land and posterity* (*Gen.* 12:1-2; 13:14-16; 15:5-7;

[10] The Bible mentions two pre-Abrahamic covenants: those of Adam (*Gen.* 2) and of Noah (*Gen.* 9:9-17), but these primitive history accounts had no actual influence on the covenant as lived out by Israel after the time of Moses. In fact, the covenant format of these stories, especially Noah, was probably the result of a late re-thinking by covenant-minded people.

[11] R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., *Private Notes on Genesis*, p. 44: "The verb . . . properly means 'shall use your name as a blessing,' but LXX and other versions understood it as a passive, 'shall be blessed through you.' This 'extended' meaning is that used in N.T., *Acts* 3:25; *Gal.* 3:8; also in *Ecclus.* 44:21. The formula recurs in 18:18; 22:18; 28:14. On either interpretation, a certain universalism is expressed. Not for himself and his descendants alone, but for all the peoples of the earth, Abraham will be the instrument and the means of blessing."

[12] Cf. *Deut.* 26:5; *Josue* 24:2-3.

17:1-8; 22:17). The land will be Canaan, the posterity like the stars of the heavens, like the sands of the sea:

"Raise your eyes now," says God, "and look out from the place where you are, north, south, east, and west; for all the *land* that you see, I am going to give to you and your descendants for all time. I am going to make your descendants like the dust of the earth, so that it will be as possible to count the dust of the earth as to count your descendants. Go and travel the length and breadth of the land; for I am giving it to you" (*Gen.* 13:14-17).

And BLOOD seals this covenant, the blood of animals. In an eerie scene Abraham procures a heifer, a she-goat, a he-goat, a dove, and a young pigeon. These he cuts in two, placing the pieces opposite each other. And "when the sun had set, and it was quite dark, there appeared a smoking fire-pot and a blazing torch that passed between the pieces. That day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham" (*Gen.* 15: 17-18).

The Abrahamic covenant included, therefore, the PROMISE and the BLOOD, but there was as yet neither divinely given law nor divinely bestowed status. Abraham's response was not obedience to a law, but Faith to a promise.[13] It was a covenant of the most primitive type, meant to serve only until the passage of centuries had allowed this seed of Abraham to grow numerically into a people.

Such was the sight which the Jew of the Mosaic covenant saw as he looked in retrospect back into the historical traditions of his forefathers, the Patriarchs. If he had enjoyed the gift of prophetic vision and had been able to gaze from the heights of Sinai across the centuries he would have seen the Mosaic covenant holding fast to its original shape and form, *except* for one significant change which was necessitated by the rise of an element foreign to early Israelite history. That element was the monarchy, a shape of government borrowed by the Jews from the surrounding nations in an attempt to garner from this form of united rule a strength sufficient to resist the Philistine invasions.[14] The monarchy changed

[13] Cf. *Rom.* 4; *Gal.* 3.

[14] Previous to the monarchy there existed the amphictyony, the tribal groups organized by covenant and centered around the sanctuary of Shiloh and/or Sichem.

UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA LIBRARIES

the theocratic rule heretofore existent in Israel and operating in the amphictyony, and in so doing introduced something novel into the covenant as well. It occasioned what we call the Davidic covenant.

THE DAVIDIC COVENANT

In general, we can say that the Davidic dynasty in no way abrogated the covenant between God and Mosaic Israel.[15] But now, because the people have chosen to have a king as their personal representative, the PROMISES are no longer made by God directly to the people, but rather to the *King*. It is this change of direction that we see in Nathan's famous prophecy to David in *II Sam.* 7.[16] The promises are of universal and eternal kingship to David's successors. It is by being faithful to these promises to the king that God will bless the people.[17] But they will be blessed only indirectly, as a result of God's direct blessings on the king.

Another facet of the Mosaic covenant has been similarly nuanced: the STATUS. Where it was the people under Moses which became the "son of God, the first-born son," now it is the king: "I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me," says God through Nathan (*II Sam.* 7:14). The king becomes God's son, the representative of the people to God, of God to the people.

[15] Mowinkel, *He That Cometh,* translated by G. W. Anderson (American Edition), p. 166: "It is not expressly stated in the Old Testament that the covenant with David is identical with the covenant on Sinai, including and continuing it; but the idea itself is present, and is clearly brought out in the statement that the promises of the Davidic covenant are the essential content of the covenant which Yahweh will now make 'with you,' i.e., with the Jews." And in the same work (p. 239) we find: "The covenant with David is identical with the covenant with Israel. But, of the two, the covenant with Israel is fundamental, whereas the covenant with David is a specific instance of it. . . ." John L. McKenzie, "Royal Messianism," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* XIX (1957), 26-30, agrees: "He [the king] is the incorporation of his people, and in him are recapitulated the covenant of Israel and the promises and obligations which flow from the covenant. . . . Hence it may be said with Albrecht Alt, that the covenant of David tends to absorb the ancient covenant of Israel."

[16] Cf. the entire article, "Royal Messianism," of McKenzie, on this point.

[17] God's blessings because of His fidelity, the famous *hesed we'emeth* of O.T. covenant language. Cf. *Ps.* 24:10; *Ps.* 39:10; *Ps.* 56:4; *Ps.* 60:8. The whole of *Psalm* 88 is devoted to this theme. John's "full of grace and truth" (*John* 1:14) has the same connotation.

The king's person and office are sacred, set apart from the profane, and consecrated to God's service. As Mowinkel notes:

> The king is the natural, official leader of the public cult of the nation, even if on ordinary occasions the priest officiates in his stead. He is the channel through which Yahweh's blessings flow to the people, being conveyed primarily through his cultic functions. . . . Although in virtue of his equipment (anointing and Yahweh's spirit) he is "divine" and more than an ordinary human being, and although as leader in the cult he is the representative of the Deity, yet in a still higher degree he is the representative of the people in the presence of the Deity; he prays, intercedes, offers up sacrifice, and receives power and blessing. The covenant is concentrated in him; and through him and his line the promises are mediated. Through him the congregation stands before God and meets God.[18]

The famous seventh verse of *Psalm* 2, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," has a great deal of this kingly sacredness inspiring it.[19] But the main lines of the Mosaic covenant remain untouched. The Davidic covenant gave a special turn to it; it by no means replaced it. We may say with Pedersen:

> David and Moses became the main pillars in the two views of history which formed the background of the Israelite confidence in life, but to later Israel their importance seemed less due to what they *did* than to what they *received*. In the covenant which they both had with Yahweh, the people saw a guarantee that its God would continue to bestow his blessing on it. It gave self-confidence to the people in a peculiar way, not by achievements which they could regard as theirs, but by the consciousness of being chosen by the Almighty.[20]

It is against this covenant background that the O.T. books must be read. Once the covenant was enacted, all history was interpreted

[18] Mowinkel, *op. cit.*, p. 89. For justification of this, cf. *III Kings* 8: 54-66.

[19] So also *Psalm* 88. Cf. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (London, 1950), p. 64: "Ps. 89 (88) speaks of the Davidic king as 'chosen out of the people' (v. 19), as Yahweh's anointed servant (v. 20), whom Yahweh will strengthen, defeat his enemies (vv. 21-25), follow with faithfulness and loyalty *(hesed)*. He will call God 'father,' and God will make him his firstborn, 'higher than the kings of the earth' (v. 27). With him God has made a covenant so that his throne shall endure 'as the days of heaven.'"

[20] Pedersen, *op. cit.*, III-IV, 664.

in its light.[21] Was Israel victorious? This was a sign of Yahweh's fidelity to His promises. Did disaster come upon the nation? Yahweh must be punishing it for its disobedience. Man's whole life, consequently, had been taken into the divine sphere, for his actions were now either for or against God, for or against God's law.

The Abrahamic-Mosaic-Davidic covenants, great as they were, were never meant to be the mature growth, the ultimate in the divine plan of salvation. All were, of their essence, covenants of PROMISE. A fulfillment was required, a fulfillment along the lines of that prophesied by Jeremias:

> "Behold, days are coming," is the oracle of the Lord, "when I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers on the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt—that covenant of mine which they broke, so that I had to reject them—but this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days," is the oracle of the Lord: "I will put my law within them, and will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (*Jer.* 31:31-33).

It is amazing, inspiring, to see what the fulfillment, the fourth step in the history of divine covenant has done to the preceding three. This fourth step is, of course, the Christian covenant.[22]

THE CHRISTIAN COVENANT, THE COVENANT OF THE NEW LAW

"Do not suppose that I have come to do away with the Law or the Prophets. I have not come to do away with them but to complete them," said Christ (*Matt.* 5:17). Let us see for a moment in what fashion this completing was accomplished. The main elements of covenant in the Old Law were, as we have seen, PROMISE, LAW, BLOOD, STATUS. Christ has retained all of them,

[21] History for the Jews was much more the history of *God's* dealings with His people than a history of the people itself. The people were not the slightest bit important except that they had been chosen by Yahweh as His own.

[22] The primitive Church was fully aware of her role as Church of the New Covenant. St. Paul especially witnesses to this fact. Cf. *Gal.* 4:24 for the Sara-Agar allegory; *II Cor.* 3:6 for New Testament of the Spirit; *Col.* 2:11-12 for spiritual circumcision; *I Cor.* 5:7 for New Passover; *I Cor.* 11:25 for Blood of the New Testament. On this same point, cf. "Messianic Fulfillment," in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* XIX (1957), 477-478.

but has purified each, developing each along spiritual and supernatural lines. Do the PROMISES remain? Certainly, but that of the *land* has been used as a springboard from which the spiritual mind can soar into the concept of an eternal heaven. To the Christian people is pledged a home, a promised land wherein eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor the mind of man imagined the things that God has prepared for those who love Him. "Blessed are the meek for they shall possess the *earth*" (*Matt.* 5:4). What earth? A spiritual heaven.

A LAW, too, remains to determine the actions of men, to make them Godlike. But here, also, a change. The law of justice has grown into the law of charity. "Love, therefore, is the complete fulfillment of the Law" (*Rom.* 13:10). The law of Mt. Sinai has been replaced by that of the Mount of Beatitudes.

We know all too well what a profound growth has affected the idea of BLOOD in the covenant. The blood that sealed Abraham's agreement, the blood that was sprinkled on the people by Moses was the blood of animal sacrifices. In the New Law it is Christ Himself Who is sacrificed, Christ Who becomes the Victim, Who becomes our Passover. What more permanent, what more valuable seal could have united God and His Christian people into a perpetual union than the blood of the God made man: "For I myself have received from the Lord," says St. Paul, "that the Lord Jesus, on the night in which he was betrayed, took bread. . . . In like manner, also the cup, after he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'" (*I Cor.* II: 23-25).[23]

And the STATUS, what has happened to that? The Mosaic people were the first sons of God,[24] then came the Davidic kings,[25]

[23] All four N.T. descriptions of the consecration preserve the term "covenant" *(diathēkē)* in the Blood formula. *Matt.* 26:28 and *Mark* 14:24 have the simple *"diathēkē,"* a direct allusion to *Exod.* 24:8. The formula of *I Cor.* 11:25 and *Luke* 22:20 carries the modification "new covenant" (*kainē diathēkē*), which incorporates both *Exod.* 24:8 and *Jer.* 31:31.

[24] *Matt.* 2:15, by attributing to Christ Osee's original reference to the Israelites ("Out of Egypt I have called my son") has understood in a profound, spiritual manner that the Sonship of Christ has fulfilled the sonship of Israel.

[25] Note Matthew's insistence on Christ as the descendant of David in *Matt.* 1:1, 17, 20. As such He is the legitimate receiver of the promises and gifts made to the Davidic kings. Cf. also *Luke* 1:32-33.

UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT LIBRARIES

each united to Yahweh with a sacred bond. But what an immense flowering of concept in the Christian era. Christ, the Davidic king, is, by that fact alone, the son of God. But by His own Personality, He is THE SON of God, the Son by very nature. As such He makes all men who become part of His Body adopted sons of God. Could Israel be called God's son as being His people? Certainly. Then, how much more truly can we be called the sons of God, we who are baptized into the dying and rising of Christ the God-man, we who are united to His Body by consuming the Eucharistic species!

With this point the turn of the wheel is complete, the plan of divine providence is fully revealed. As Siegman has remarked: "What in a sense began amid the convulsions of Sinai is brought to its climax in the peace and intimacy of the cenacle."[26] The faint glimpse of light seen back in the times of the patriarchs,[27] that fanned into a flame atop Mt. Sinai, has now been completely exposed in Christ. This is Paul's "mystery," the union of all men in Christ, and in Christ with God.

There is still an agreement, a covenant, between God and His people. He is our God and we His people in a way not true of any other people, or creed, or sect.[28] The initiative in the way of salvation still lies with God. And this is the way He has chosen. His PROMISES are made to the SON OF GOD, and to those united to Him . . . promises of the hundredfold in this life and then the *promised land,* life everlasting, to those who keep His LAW of *charity.* And sealing this agreement is the BLOOD of His Son, a blood re-presented to God, set on His altar and given to His people, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.

NEAL M. FLANAGAN, O.S.M.

Stonebridge Priory
Lake Bluff, Illinois

[26] E. Siegman, C.PP.S., in *AER,* 136 (1957), 172.

[27] Paul's insistence on Christ as THE seed of Abraham in whom were fulfilled the promises is too well known to demand exposition. Cf. *Rom.* 9:6-8; *Gal.* 3:7-9; 3:29. Cf. also *John* 8:33-59.

[28] Cf. the discussion of Paul's use of *peripoiēsis* and *periousios* in "Messianic Fulfillment," *CBQ, loc. cit.,* p. 479.

PROBLEMS OF THE LAY APOSTOLATE

One of the most important ideas to get into our minds today is that the Church never chooses the method whereby she gives to the world the divine life; it is imposed on her by the environment of which she is part, and it is the action of leaven. The message of salvation, which is received by faith, and the efficacious channels of grace, which are the sacraments, remain always the same: identical in every age and forever immutable. But human life and the factors which condition it do change: one age differs from another in any number of respects. And the Church takes men as she finds them, and imparts to them in each succeeding generation, just as they are, the word of life and the Bread of life without which their lives are an utter failure.

As an example of the Church's keen sense of reality, her vivid appreciation of men and their shifting moods and mores, consider the history of the foreign missionary apostolate. At the time of the Catholic empires of Spain and Portugal, it was the Catholic Kings who carried almost the full weight of the responsibility for bringing the faith to the newly-discovered pagan lands. The 16th and 17th centuries were a period during which the idea of absolute monarchy reached a high-water mark on the continent: men everywhere (save England and, increasingly, in the new world of the English colonies) regarded this political system as the most suitable for their needs and the realization of their desires. King and clergy together—and not only in so-called Catholic countries—took the initiative in every form of religious activity, almost to the exclusion of the laity. Not until the 19th century do we see a new orientation, with responsibility for matters of serious importance being entrusted, in what seemed like an unprecedented measure, to layfolk.

The 19th century was indeed a turning-point in the relationship of the laity to the apostolic work of the Church of God. One can trace the same development in the history of the Church in English-speaking countries. Recall the great prophecy uttered by Bishop Challoner towards the close of the 18th century, about "a new people" coming into being to take over from the Catholic landed gentry who, after centuries of preserving the faith through their

system of "little Romes" (or islands of Catholic life built up around Catholic estates), were—with the Catholic Relief Acts—to concede their place of honor in the magnificent struggle to survive. So too, in the United States: by the turn of the century, even before the last huge waves of Catholic immigrants had thrown themselves upon our shores, the ghetto mentality and the isolationist spirit which had huddled the faithful into tight groups alienated from the full life of American society were fast disappearing. Above all, the layman was beginning to speak out, and to be heard, in profession of his faith.

In perhaps different ways, these examples all stress the fact that the new methods used by the Church in her approach to men were not substitutes, or making the best of a bad job, but imposed on the Church *by the state of society* at the time. In America, for instance, the shoots of democracy had sprouted to considerable size, the whole political and civic atmosphere and viewpoint were now vastly different from that which had prevailed, say, in 16th century Spain or 17th century France. Human nature is, to be sure, the same always: but men are more than "human nature," and it is with men that the Church must deal. And she has always known how, for she has with her and in her, always, the Divine Spirit Who searches the innermost hearts of men and the Living Christ Who, in our age no less than when He walked the hill country of Judea, knows what is in men.

Consider now some of the implications which the above paragraphs have for the terrible problem of "leakage" which plagues the Church today in almost every country. To approach the problem with any hope of reaching a solution, it is necessary above all to understand the state of contemporary society.

This for two reasons: first, because the action of the Church, being that of a leaven, is determined as to its method by the *milieux* in which she acts; secondly, because the leakage is fundamentally not a question of how many fail to conform to the laws of the Church, but the far more important problem of how many, both old and young, are failing to interpret contemporary life according to Christian principles. The peculiar mystery of Christianity is not the transcendence of God, of the Church, of grace. It is not that Jesus Christ is God; nor is it that Jesus Christ is man. It is that at one and the same time Jesus Christ is God

and man. Christianity itself, therefore, is endowed with a theandric character which is similar to and derives from the unique personality of its Divine Founder; and as the Church is both human and divine, so too her mission is to incarnate among men the mystery of divine truth and the gift of divine grace whereby men are divinized. The work of the Church, then, is inextricably bound up with temporal conditions: into the human soil *as it is* she must insert the seeds of truth and of grace, and according to the nature and qualities of that soil must she cultivate the seed until it bring forth fruit at harvest time.

What, therefore, are the characteristics of the age in which we live? The reason that so many of the older generation write off present-day youth as a bad job is mainly that they themselves are conscience-stricken and realize only too clearly—and too late, perhaps—that the old traditions and accepted conventions are no longer adequate to interpret this extraordinarily complex system we call modern civilization. Many have simply given up trying to understand the spirit which most powerfully holds and moves men today or the rushing currents which sweep across our pluralist society from so many directions. We have to understand our age, its deepest needs and strongest aspirations, before we can begin to work effectively, in the right directions and employing the appropriate methods, to renew the world.

But the Age of the Easy Answer has come to an end and the world is in revolution. In a very real sense the world is always undergoing a revolution, a more or less violent upheaval of the existing order of things: in various spheres, the religious, the political, the economic, the cultural, the social. Never before, however, has human society been so universally or so intensely disturbed by revolution in every area of human life. The impact of this ecumenical upheaval is felt in the religious sphere more forcefully than in any other, and it must be taken into account. The turmoil which we are now witnessing has changed the character of the problems which call for most urgent and immediate attention. Solutions once thought applicable are now outdated. We are definitely passing through a period of groping, experimentation, and uncertainty. Guided by the unwavering light of faith and the actual teachings of the Church's magisterium, we need not fear that we shall not find a solution to our deepest problems; but

even we Catholics are at times confused and puzzled: the situation is extremely grave and it is bound to disquiet us.

For the normal Christian to isolate himself from this crisis, or to fail to understand it—as so many do, by limiting the practice of their faith to Church-going—would mean, first, that through her members the Church is being isolated from contemporary life, and secondly, that the individual member has a completely inadequate idea of the Church. Because she continues in time the Incarnation of The Word of God, the Church needs the world as much as the world needs the Church. The Church, as the Body of Christ, is incarnated in space and time. It is, as Cardinal Suhard wrote, contingent on history and on geography. It follows, then, inevitably, that in a time of revolution, in her approach to men—who are, always, men of their age—the Church will herself take on an aspect which is revolutionary. Such an adaptation does not require the Church to modify in any way those elements which must ever remain immutable. It does not entail a renunciation of any doctrinal realities. It is rather a question of showing these realities to be eternally new and attractive, by methods comparable to those which, in the course of history, enabled the Church to come triumphantly through so many crises. It is a question of giving these realities a new brilliance and of bringing into relief those aspects which are most calculated to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of modern men.

CREATIVE TREATMENT OF ACTUALITY

John Grierson of documentary film fame defined this type of motion picture as *the creative treatment of actuality*. One might use the same definition to describe the role of the Christian in the world today. It is to interpret in the light of Christian teaching the contemporary scene, or to insert the whole of the truth of faith into the whole of the truth of reality. What else is this but a description of St. Pius X's program to "restore all things in Christ"?

The great Cardinal of Paris characterized this work of Christianizing the world variously as a realistic apostolate, a missionary

apostolate, a leaven, a testimony, an ascending incarnation. Speaking of the method this work will adopt, Suhard writes:

> The modern apostolate can in no wise adopt a negative attitude of retreat or of protection from pernicious influences, nor just a propaganda, nor even a "conquest," if we understand by this an exterior annexation of subjects or human currents. The victory of the Church is not a matter of isolation. One can no more isolate Christianity than one can keep an organism away from virulent germs. It breathes them every day, but its reaction triumphs over them. So it is with the Christian. His action is clearly indicated. It is a conflict of living forces in which it is clear that one has no limits in relation to the other. He does not choose his method. His manner of acting is imposed upon him by the milieu he lives in: it is the action of leaven. Without moving he finds himself called to the duty and the work of a missionary. His effort will not therefore consist only of recruiting, and of making unbelievers "come to him," but especially of mixing with them to save them as they are: a centrifugal action which must make of the Church the "leaven" of the immense mass, and the young blood which will give it life.[1]

This is precisely what our modern youth are in search of: they desperately need to interpret the world of the 20th century and in many respects they are searching alone and unaided. Why they leave the Church or are ineffective in the Church is mainly because the Church they know is absent from that world. Contemporary life flows on as though the Church did not exist and many members are quite content to believe that the Church will weather the storm unhampered by refusing to embody herself in temporal institutions. Nothing could be farther from the true mind of the Church, which must act according to her nature. We must never succumb to the temptation to think that the Church is at a loss what to do, that she is seemingly hesitating more than others. In many areas the Church does not have ready-made solutions to be pulled out of a drawer on the right occasion. But she always possesses the principles, the guiding ideas which should make it possible for us to find a Christian and a human solution to our gravest difficulties,

[1] Emmanuel Cardinal Suhard, *Growth or Decline*, translated by J. J. Corbett (Chicago: Fides, 1950), pp. 87-88.

a doctrine by which we can judge the various proposals of men, or eliminate or reject those solutions which fail to recognize our true nature as men and our true destiny as redeemed by Christ.

The chief way to save our youth is to shake Catholics from that deceptive security in which they are held fast even in this time of crisis for the world. For the worst result of this deception shows its head in the traditional way the social teaching of the Church is understood and interpreted today by many. The heart of the matter seems to be this: while all admit that the thought of present-day commercial, competitive culture is out of touch with the thought of the Church, it is never suggested that there is some danger that some within the Church are out of touch with the prevailing climate of thought in modern life.

What we mean can be illustrated by reference to the labor movement in our country. The fact which is most striking here is the serious lack of Christian leadership among the organized workers, so many of whom are Catholics. Why has leadership come, all too often, from the Communist Party? Only because the majority of Catholics do not see the relationship of Christian principles with the world of work. One attitude is expressed in somewhat the following terms: the Church has, indeed, been very good to the poor in time of want—and that is what she is for, to relieve misery and aid the destitute by her works of charity. Or again, many feel that priests, with every good intention, have a "working-class" mentality and rather patronize the working-class, and this is resented.

If all this be true, then it can mean only one thing: that some within the Church, and we mean right down to the parochial level, are out of touch with important trends and tendencies in contemporary society. And that is very bad, for it involves a failure on our part, thus far, to incarnate Christian truth and grace in every area of human life, in everything human. God became man in order that men might become sons of God: such is, according to the Fathers, the whole circuit of the Redemptive Incarnation. To be an apostle, therefore, is to embrace everything which may legitimately be approached in man and in the world he has fashioned. That means everything except sin: all values, even those foreign to Christianity when they are not simply, as Chesterton expressed it, its own ideas gone mad.

LEADERSHIP IN INDUSTRY

To see this incarnational mission, which cannot be neglected without deviating from the ideal of authentic Christianity, we may consider some of its aspects as it is developed in the field of industry and in the social order at large. What are the leading ideas, the controlling factors today in the industrial order, in particular with regard to human relations?

Experts in this field would list the following: to develop leadership in industry from the ranks, to accept as demonstrated that the status of the worker is the secret of higher productivity, and to make human relations in industry the corner-stone of future development. The influence of the social teaching of the Church is evident in much of this development, but what is more important to note is that the changes which are happening in modern industrialized life themselves determine the method which the Church uses to win the world to Christ. As was pointed out above, the Church's *method,* whereby she resolves the contradiction between the truth of faith and the abuses and anomalies in the human order which are the by-product of human sin and waywardness, is imposed on her by the environment of which she wills to be a vital part.

Thus, the official mind of the Church is not one of paternalism, but one of belief, confidence, and trust that through the laity the whole temporal order will be restored to Christ. In the light of revealed principles the intelligent Christian can perceive more clearly and more accurately the roots and causes of industrial unrest today, and the dignity of the laborer and of human labor as well as the sense of responsibility he must have to and for others in human society.

The Bishops of the United States have reiterated these basic considerations for many years. The laity, says the Church, is today, more than ever, irreplaceable, not because the Church is in a mess and must make the best of a bad job, but because in present-day society the laity has really reached its majority, and the Church is living in a social environment where the ordinary man and woman have been educated to play some part in making the world. The Church must keep in touch with the world: she does so, precisely, in and through the laity, who are, by their very vocation, *in* the world (although not "of" it, as Christ warned).

WHERE LEAKAGE STARTS

This, then, is contemporary society in which the Church exists. How many thousands are yearly lost to the faith? It is not difficult to see where the solution to the leakage is to be found. Some young people leave the practice of their religion, and the rest are so ineffective in witnessing to it, because the faith *as they possess it is* inadequate for them to interpret the contemporary scheme. Somewhere along the line there has been an arrestment in the development of that faith and usually it is between the ages of 13 and 15. This will seem like an extraordinarily young age at which to assign the failure of which we are speaking; nevertheless, it is by no means arbitrary and there are a number of signs which confirm the choice and reasons to explain it. We cannot enlarge upon this point in the present essay: let it stand, tentatively, and let us go on to observe some of its manifestations.

Thus, for example, the young worker when faced with trade union problems would not dream of taking them to the Church, to the priest (for in his mind, most often, Church equals priest and vice versa): but he might be persuaded to take his problems to the Communists, that is, to the worker in his industry who represents the Communist Party. He does identify the workingman's problems somehow with the program this Party is alleged to support, but he is quite unaware that there is any well-defined labor program to be found within the framework of Christian social teaching. He accepts the doctrine that the poor in spirit are blessed, because he reverences the revealed word of God and the Church which is its custodian, but he fails to see its relevance to any of the specific problems of modern industry. So, too, when a young worker discovers the existence of "factory marriages," he will not tell the priest how this has troubled him, but will more than likely follow the crowd—perhaps to the point of a nervous breakdown.

According to reliable statistics, those who give up the practice of their religion do so usually within the first twelve months of work. Observers have added that it is very frequently the more perceptive type of youngster and the one who throws himself wholeheartedly into life who goes. Now this suggests that the immediate problem is not the fact that a good proportion give up the practice of the faith, but that the idea they possess of the "practice" of one's faith is too narrow and not real enough to help

them bridge the entry into adult life. Too many are confirmed in the opinion that "faith" involves a very narrow evaluation of Christian life, mainly geared to Sunday Mass attendance and the occasional reception of the sacraments, which is the accepted hallmark of success in making our young people "good Catholics."

Two points from papal teaching should be made, in order to clarify the meaning of the lay apostolate.

First, that the apostolate of the laity is *distinct* from that of the priest, though not capable of fulfillment without the formation and guidance of the priest. A great deal of unnecessary confusion and discord would be avoided if this distinction were sufficiently realized and respected. The apostolate of the laity springs from their *vocation,* and it is the duty of their state to direct the institutions of which they are members to their proper end and to infuse in them the Christian spirit. The laity are not the hands and feet of the priest; they have their own apostolic vocation as of right. Rather, laity and priests, both according to their proper function in the Mystical Body, are the hands and feet of Christ their Head.

Secondly, the role of the laity in the Church is exercised in the lay or temporal or, if you will, secular-order: the order of the family, the trade union, the university, the office, the factory, the school, the government. To gear the lay apostolate to the administration of the parish, as so often it is in this country, confuses the issue, isolates the Church from the world and generates paternalism on the one side (the priest's), and on the other (the laity's) either do-nothingism or, in extremity, anti-clericalism. While it is certainly true that the parish is the primary ecclesiastical unit, it is not the primary unit of aggregation or function in human life as such: and it is the latter which must be Christianized, totally and immediately.

When we consider the present necessities, we are obliged to admit that we are still at the beginning of things, as if nothing had been done. The priest's part is enormously demanding, but its difficulty is more than matched by the knowledge that he is God's chosen instrument in the work. No priest yet who has witnessed the flowering into full Christian manhood of youth under his direction, and seen them dedicating their lives to the Church in the lay apostolate, would exchange the experience for

all the gold in the world. To implement this ideal, critical study and reflection are needed, as well as an open mind and a pure, dedicated heart; but most of all, prayer and a thoroughly intensified life of the spirit, for this is the Soul of the apostolate.

JOHN PATRICK REID, O.P.

Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September 1910, contributed by Fr. F. G. Holweck of St. Louis, concludes his series of "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary." The author presents historical arguments for this doctrine, but then gives the dogmatic arguments, which he regards as more cogent. He concludes with the statement that not a few eminent theologians maintain that the Catholic truth of our Lady's integral assumption is proximately definable. . . . Fr. H. G. Hughes, of England, writing on "Apologetics for the Common Man," asserts that arguments of a moral nature, designed to prove not only the credibility of Christianity but also its goodness, should be used in popular apologetics. . . . Fr. J. C. Macmillan, of Canada, calls for a deeper study of positive theology. He believes that in every seminary the students should "acquire a maximum of positive theology in the shortest measure of time, and with the least possible waste of energy." . . . Fr. H. Ganss, of Lancaster, Pa., gives some newly discovered data about Martin Luther, but adds that much more is needed to give a correct picture of the celebrated founder of Lutheranism. . . . A writer signing himself New-Scholasticus defends the view, advocated in some previous issues, that the State may sterilize sex perverts in order to defend itself against the procreation of undesirable citizens. The same principle is advocated by Fr. T. Labouré, O.M.I. The opposite opinion (the only one now admissible since the *Casti connubii* of Pope Pius XI) is championed by Fr. J. De Becker of Louvain. . . . Fr. W. J. McGurk pleads for a greater effort on the part of pastors to protect adolescents from the evil of drink through the establishment of temperance societies and the administration of the pledge on the occasion of Confirmation and First Communion. . . . There is also in this issue a brief description of the coat-of-arms of Pope Pius X by a writer signing himself Al. B.

F. J. C.

MARY AND CULTURE

There are any number of ways in which the Mother of Christ has come to influence the course of human life, but not the least of these is her relationship to Christian culture. It is here that the Christian heart gives profound expression to those truths and values which it prizes most highly, and it is here that Mary is particularly important.

Only at the end of God's creative activity did He bring forth man—the most noble and perfect expression here on earth of the power and majesty of God. While all of creation was to be a reflection of the Infinite Wisdom and Beauty of God, man—unlike any other being upon earth—was to mirror in a special way this Image of the living God. As the Book of Sirach explains:

> The Lord from the earth created man, and in his own image he made him. . . . He forms men's tongues and eyes and ears, and imparts to them an understanding heart. With wisdom and knowledge he fills them; good and evil he shows them. He looks with favor upon their hearts, and shows them his glorious works, that they may describe the wonders of his deed and praise his holy name.[1]

This is the glory of man. He alone among the creatures of earth possesses not only the powers of hearing, of sight, of speaking, but the gift of wisdom—the power of knowing, of thinking, of reasoning, and hence also the power of freely praising the glories of God the Creator.

A brief glance at the history and nature of man shows clearly enough the manner in which his God-given intellect has sought to enlist the powers of his body in the praise of God.

Man sought first to enlist the realm of *sound* in order to describe the world about him and the deep thoughts within. Thus was born the power of speech: the striving of man to express in outward, perceptible, ordered sound the thoughts rooted within the very depths of his being. But even more: man, the thinking being, could not be satisfied with a mere communication by means of sounding

[1] *Sirach* 17:1, 5-8.

words. He wished to enlist language in the expression of what mere words of themselves could not reflect. He wished to use the power of speech to communicate the even more profound thoughts he recognized within his being. And thus did man come, step by step, to the creation of true literature. In poetry and delicate shades of prose he sought to leap beyond the limitations of matter and sound; he sought to give expression to the inexpressible sentiments, desires and aspirations that welled up within his heart. Out of this developed one facet of human culture: the world of literature and poetry.

In similar fashion, man turned his attention to other aspects of the world of sound. He considered the meaning of sound: the tinkling of a bit of metal, the song of the bird, the humming of the human voice. He analyzed these sounds and discovered the laws of harmony which regulate them. He invented other instruments which would produce new and unique sounds, and to these he also applied the harmonic laws he had discovered. And thus was fashioned the world of music, in which man sought, through harmonic sound, to express thoughts, feelings, emotions that even words could not express—things that not even literature of the highest sort could express in the very same way.

And then his ever-inventive mind continued to regard himself and the created world, and it discovered other means of giving expression to the deep thoughts and aspirations which lay unspoken within the depths of his being. He regarded the material world, and saw in it not simply the means of fashioning a shelter against the heat of summer and the cold of winter, but a means of once again expressing, in what he builds, the deepest sentiments of his heart. And thus step by step the world of architecture developed, reflecting in stone and glass, in form and design, the deepest thoughts of mankind.

When man regarded the world of color, he discovered still other means by which he himself could control and direct this color, so that it would become a tool in his hands for expressing these same depths of human experience. From this resulted the world of art, of sculpture and painting, which was to set forth not merely a copy of the things man saw about him, but an *interpretation* of those things—a reflection of the man who brought them

into being, a revelation of *his* view of life and of the basic principles in that life which form his personal grasp of reality. This was the world of art.

Out of all of this—literature, poetry, music, art—has resulted the culture of man. It is constituted by these most highly developed means of expressing what lies imbedded within the heart of man. Cultures have varied through the centuries, dependent upon what lies within those depths. Different men at different times and different places have considered many varied elements to be the most noble aspect of their lives; and the culture which they produced has tended to give expression to that. For those who considered sense and the material world to be the most noble aspect of life, art and music and literature necessarily reflected a materialistic and sensate culture. Those, on the other hand, who valued most highly the spiritual side of human life attempted to give expression to this in the culture they produced.

It is on this basis, then, that we distinguish Christian culture from all others. No less than the rest of mankind, the Christian has his own view and interpretation of human life—a life that has been supernaturalized both in its being and its destiny. He strives accordingly to give expression to this view in the works of art, music, literature that he produces. And thus is born a truly Christian culture, revealing in most subtle and artistic fashion the meaning of life as perceived by the believer within the depths of his grace-endowed being.

Such a Christian culture will naturally seek to give expression to the basic truths of Christian faith. These are psychologically perceptible to the Christian; he is deeply aware of them and they have altered radically his grasp of life and its true meaning. Thus in this Christian culture we see reflected the love of God, the weakness of fallen man, the redemption of Christ, and the salvation of the sinner. The most noble of poetic phrases, the most deftly fashioned prose, the finest expression in music and art and architecture has been enlisted in the effort of communicating to God the Christian praise, and to fellow-men the Christian joy that is brought forth by this revelation of reality through Christ.

Considering these various elements, then, it is not difficult to understand what a truly Christian culture must be. While other

men will strive to set forth in the various forms of culture the sentiments and aspirations that are most important and most fundamenal for them, the Chrisian will turn his efforts towards the message of Christ, which forms the center of his entire existence. The poetry, music, art that he produces will reflect that which lies most deep within the Christian heart, and will seek to give expression to that which words and sound alone cannot express, apart from this artistic creation.

It is here that Mary, the Mother of God, has entered into the production of Christian culture. Next to Christ, there is no one who was involved more intimately in the redeeming work of the Incarnate God. Through her, Christ took flesh and entered into our world; with her standing at the foot of His Cross as the Queen of Martyrs, Christ offered His life for our salvation. These two were joined most intimately by God in effecting the redemption of mankind, and they remain most intimately united in bringing this about in our personal lives: Christ, the Giver of all good graces, and Mary His Mother, the universal Mediatrix of those graces.

A quick glance at the artistic productions of truly Christian culture will reveal at once the profound influence that Mary has had upon it. Hundreds of churches throughout the world have striven to give expression in stone and marble to the importance of Mary in the plan of salvation, to the love and devotion accorded to her by a Christian people: the Church of St. Mary in Ephesus, Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome, Notre Dame de Chartres, Notre Dame de Paris, the Frauenkirche in Munich, the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, and a host of others on every continent.

Innumerable poets have sought to enlist the world of speech in the effort of expressing, in prose and poetry, the glories of Mary in her relationship to Christ: the *Salve Regina,* the *Regina Coeli,* the *Sub tuum praesidium* that dates back to the third century—the best known Latin hymns, whose sentiments have been repeated over and over in every language on earth as the Christian strives, each in his own tongue, to sing the glories of the Virgin Mother of God, "our tainted nature's solitary boast."

Artists, too, and sculptors have never tired of seeking to express that favorite of all Christian scenes, the picture of the Infant

Saviour nestled in the arms of His sinless Mother. They have not sought to produce, of course, what would amount to little more than a photograph of these two central figures in the story of salvation. Quite the contrary, they have attempted to interpret the full meaning of that message, and to portray in their works of art the innocence, the devotion, the universal love of this Mother who embraces in her arms not simply the Christchild, but the entire human race. From the earliest images in the catacombs of Rome, down through the ages, the handiwork of a Cimabue, a Giotto, a Fra Angelico, a Lippi, a Dürer, a Raphael, a Michaelangelo, a Botticelli, of hundreds of artists down to the present hour has endeavored to present in endless variety the meaning of Mary to the Christian heart. The Madonna portrayed in the garb of the Eskimo has taken its place alongside the African Madonna, the Madonna of the Far East and the Madonna of India. The universal import of Mary has been expressed in this universality of portrayal.

Musicians too have labored to set forth in melody and song the deep-rooted love for Christ's Mother that lies embedded in the heart of Christian faith, and to the end of time the chaste melodies of the Marian hymns in Gregorian chant will vie with the great hymns of the modern era in giving due honor to Mary: *O Sanctissima,* the Lourdes Hymn, *Maria zu lieben.* . . . And over and over again, the *Stabat Mater* of Pergolesi, the *Vespro Della Beata Vergine* of Monteverdi, the *Magnificat* of Bach will reecho the importance of Mary as expressed by the world of harmonic sound: voices and instruments joined together in order to set forth what neither words nor music alone could say.

Mary has, in this way, contributed to the formation of a Christian culture in a very great degree. She has exercised this power over the vast area in which such Christian culture has developed: in the home, in the concert hall, in the libraries and art galleries of the world, but above all in the liturgy of the Church, where all of these elements combine to enhance the official worship of God offered by the members of Christ.

The Blessed Mother has exercised this influence, however, only because she is so important to Christians and to the Christian faith. The natural tendency of man to express what is most profound in his being could not be frustrated with the coming of Christ

through Mary. This natural tendency turned upon the good news of Christ, and recognized therein the true meaning of human existence. Finding in the mystery of the Incarnation the real depths of human existence, man then sought to give expression to this in the most noble fashion possible. And thus out of the depths of the Christian heart was Mary brought forth into the world of artistic endeavor, preaching in sound and form the message that completely captivates the hearts of those who have listened to the voice of Christ. Even those who do not personally grasp this vision as yet have, in their own way, attempted to give expression to this mystery rooted in the Christian heart; and in so doing, they have often found Christ through Mary.

For that reason, the relationship of Mary to Christian culture is much the same as the overall relationship of Mary to Christ. She is to lead us to her divine Son. In discovering the beauty of Mary through the various works of art that have come forth from the Christian culture, we are led on to discover also the joy of Christ. Mary is important because Christ is more important; she has been a profound inspiration in the formation of a Christian culture because she leads us to Christ, the center and heart of all Christian devotion. And thus all the magnificent hymns and poems, the masterpieces of music and art that sing her praises are, in reality, singing the praises of Christ her Son and of Christian truth. Mary is a part of the whole, but a most important part. In honoring her, we praise her Son; and in finding her we discover that Eternal Light who cast His rays upon the darkness of mankind in order to direct our steps toward that throne of everlasting Peace and all-consuming Beauty where we find at last enduring joy.

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE MORAL VIRTUES IN ST. THOMAS

II

TEMPERANCE

(As contained in the Summa Theologica, II-II, qq. 141-170.)

Temperance is a virtue since it inclines man to seek his good which is that of reason. Temperance can be understood as a general virtue in that moderation is a requisite of all virtuous activity. As a special virtue with a special subject matter, it aims to keep the pursuit of those goods that give passionate pleasure and whose lack causes passionate sorrow under the governance of *reason* and thus impose *moderation*. Temperance (antonomastically) concerns the greatest pleasures, which are connected with more necessary ends—scil. food for self-preservation and sexual intercourse for race maintenance. Sight, smell and especially taste provide secondary matter for Temperance's restraining. Temperance's rule is the needs of this life since this is the end which the goods that pleasure accompany must serve. Since Temperance has an outstanding praiseworthiness based on an element found in all virtue, in that it is concerned with restraining the most imperious appetites, it is a cardinal virtue.

Since it is nobler to seek the good of the many than the one, Justice and Fortitude excel Temperance.

Two inner forces must concur for Temperance: Shamefacedness and Honor. Shamefacedness shrinks from the disgrace attendant on intemperance. Shamefacedness is more concerned with the opinions of those close at hand in that these persons know us more and their disapproval is more keenly felt. It is present in the virtuous only *hypothetically:* were they to fall into any disgraceful act they would feel ashamed. Honor inclines one to the beauty of virtue: its proportion joined with the brilliance reason admires. Such are Temperance's Integral Parts.

In connection with its chief subject matter—the tendencies to sense pleasure which are hardest to avoid because most natural and necessary for the maintenance of the individual and the race —Temperance admits of division into species or subjective parts. Thus to moderate the desire for food in accordance with reason,

by having due regard for one's associates, one's person and the requirements of health, there is Abstinence. Its principal act is Fasting. Fasting is required by the natural law as far as it is needed to attain its threefold purpose: (1) to bridle the lusts of the flesh; (2) to enable the mind to rise more freely to contemplate Divine Reality; (3) to satisfy for one's sins. Fasting aims to check concupiscence while safeguarding natural needs. To this end the Ecclesiastical Law of Fasting allows but one full meal a day.

Opposed to abstinence is Gluttony: the inordinate craving and sating of one's appetite for food. This is not a mortal sin unless one would be prepared to violate God's law gravely for the pleasure of eating. In that it has a very desirable end for which other sins are committed it fulfills the notion of a capital vice. One is *sumptuous* in seeking costly food; *dainty* in seeking it well prepared; *greedy* in seeking too much of it. Gluttony leads to dullness of mind, loquaciousness, scurrility, uncleanness, unseemly joy and jocularity.

The use of intoxicating drinks is regulated by Sobriety, a virtue especially necessary to the young and women, because of their proneness to yield to concupiscence, as well as to those who counsel others, and so are in special need of clearmindedness, v.g., the aged and the clergy, and also those whose drinking would cause scandal. Ordinarily the use of intoxicants is not altogether forbidden but it can be if: (1) one is easily the worse for drinking; (2) one has a vow not to drink; (3) others would be scandalized if one drank.

Opposed to Sobriety is Drunkenness. The suspension of reason induced by excessive drinking is the penal effect of that excess. Inducing this state of intoxication is gravely sinful if this is done knowingly through an inordinate desire for pleasure in the use of intoxicants; for in this way reason, the guide of moral action, is suspended and one chances sinning. Drinking that is immoderate but not intoxicating does not exceed venial sin. Even sinful drunkenness diminishes culpability for ensuing sins, since voluntareity is lessened. (It is supposed that one did not get drunk in order to sin.)

Marital Chastity governs the desire for venereal pleasure by ordering it to its end, race maintenance. Virginity consists formally in the will never to seek venereal pleasure. Virginity is lawful since

the goods of the soul excel those of the body and among the goods of the soul the contemplative excel the active. Hence one may licitly renounce the bodily good of venereal pleasure in order to give himself more fully to contemplation.

In fact, Virginity is a virtue, since it is a greater thing wholly to renounce venereal pleasure than just to give up what is inordinate in it; this latter pertains to marital Chastity.

Virginity is more excellent than marriage in that it furthers the highest goods of the soul, scil. contemplation of God, whereas marriage seeks a bodily good and commits man and wife to the active life.

The order of reason is that everything be directed toward its end. Lust seeks venereal pleasure out of due relation to its end, scil., race maintenance. It is a capital vice since men are led to other sins for its end. As a result of lust, which involves the violent and disordered excitements of the lower passions, the higher powers are weakened. Thus reason's *understanding* is blighted by *blindness* of mind; its *counsel* by *rashness;* its *judgment* by *thoughtlessness;* its *command* by *inconstancy.* The will is led to *disordered self-love* through its desire for disordered pleasure and is even induced to *hate God* for forbidding it. A man falls into *love of this world and despair of a future world.*

In addition to marital chastity, which regulates the desire for sexual intercourse, another virtue, Prudent Reserve, is needed to order the lesser signs of love, v.g. kissing, fondling, etc. In kissing and touching specifically, i.e., *as such*—no sin is found. They are sinful, however, if ordered to a bad end, scil., any venereal pleasure outside of marriage and complete venereal pleasure by married persons outside of marital intercourse.

There are various illicit ways of procuring venereal pleasure. The most serious of all is that which violates the very principle of venereal acts which is nature. This can occur in several ways:

(a) by pollution without intercourse: *effeminancy;*
(b) by pollution through intercourse with one of the same sex: *sodomy;*
(c) through pollution with a beast: *bestiality;*
(d) by not observing the *natural order* in copulation: undue means and monstrous ways of copulation.

Of sins contrary to chastity, next in order of seriousness is incest, in that due respect for one's relatives is lacking. The grounds for condemning incest are: (a) respect would be defeated by allowing among close relatives acts one is naturally ashamed of; (b) there would be so great opportunity in family life for venereal acts that the race would be enervated; (c) social ties would be too narrow; (d) too ardent would be the love resulting both from consanguinity and marital union.

Adultery is more serious than the violating of a virgin which is called seduction. For it is graver to negate the husband's claim than the father's authority. Adultery is against the good of the adulterine children since the woman is already married. It is also against the good of her legitimate children since it renders paternity uncertain and divides her energies taking some of them away from the upbringing of her legitimate children.

Seduction (the violation of a virgin) has a special malice in that it renders marriage difficult and tends to encourage wantonness from which the desire to preserve the seal of virginity had until now preserved her. It is also a violation of paternal authority.

Fornication—intercourse between the unmarried—is gravely against the good of the child. Even in the animal kingdom, we observe that the mates stay together as long as this is required for the good of the young. Now the human child stands in great need of both parents for a long time. Hence their task of bringing up children is a life-long one; so too ought their union be. Further, promiscuity renders the paternity uncertain.

Rape adds the malice of violence and sacrilege (that of irreligion) to the already existing evils of seduction, adultery or fornication.

Continence resists vehement motion of passions that tend to seek venereal pleasure. It is in the will, therefore, and is a virtue less perfect than Temperance, which subjugates not only the will but likewise the sense appetite to reason. The incontinent man's reason dictates resistance by the will, but the will yields.

Incontinence is in the soul (more precisely in the will) and is a sin of yielding to evil passion. It is not as great a sin as intemperance. For it is a yielding to a passing passion on the will's part; the incontinent man repents immediately. But the intemperate man has a habit of indulging evil passion and rejoices in having sinned.

One incontinent in anger is not guilty of an act as bad in itself as incontinence in desire. For desire for revenge has some likeness to reason's good; anger is more due to bodily dispositions; the incontinent in desire works with pleasure, the incontinent in anger, with annoyance; the incontinent in desire works clandestinely, the incontinent in anger openly. But the results of anger are usually more injurious to the neighbor.

Meekness, which restrains anger, contributes to the same effect as Clemency, which moderates external punishment. Both are virtues in that each moderates, according to reason, anger and the meting out of punishments, respectively. These are potential parts of Temperance since they imitate its mode (restraint) in secondary matter.

These virtues of Meekness and Clemency withdraw from evil and so are lesser than those which incline toward good such as Faith, Hope and Charity, Prudence and Justice. Yet Meekness has special excellence. For anger is a great obstacle to virtue because of its impetuousness. Hence Meekness, above all virtues, makes a man self-possessed. Since, however, the pleasures of touch harass more constantly, Temperance is properly regarded as the principal virtue. Clemency, as preventing our neighbor's evil, seems to draw closest to Charity.

Some passions are of their nature evil, v.g. envy whereby one sorrows over the neighbor's good; anger is not such. For revenge can be good or evil. Anger if evil is so by exceeding reason's measure. Anger in accord with reason is deserving of praise.

If one desire revenge for a good end, he is zealously angry. But anger can fail to be reasonable when one desires that another be punished for a non-existent fault or excessively respecting a true fault or out of keeping with legal order and punishment's end: the maintaining of Justice and the correction of faults. Again, the mode of anger can be unreasonable by being immoderately fierce.

Anger which desires disproportionate revenge is in the genus of mortal sin as being against Charity and Justice. Yet because anger anticipates reason's (full) control, or because what one wills to befall another is only a trivial evil, the sin can be venial.

Anger sinful in its mode is not by its nature a mortal sin but it can become such if through anger one depart from the love of God or of the neighbor.

Regarded from the point of view of the evil willed, anger seems to be the least sin, since one desires the neighbor's evil not for his harm as one who hates or out of inordinate self-love as one who envies, but under the aspect of just revenge. But regarding the inordinateness of its mode, anger seems to be the worst sin since it moves so quickly and powerfully.

Anger can proceed from a choleric disposition whereby one is prone to anger; or it can occur because its cause is too long remembered—thus one is sullen and grievous to himself; or because one desires revenge too persistently—thus ill-tempered and stern people refuse to lay aside anger until they are avenged.

Anger is considered a capital vice for two reasons: (1) because its object, desired under the aspect of good, leads to many sins; (2) because through its mode, which is impetuous, it plunges the mind into all kinds of inordinate acts.

Anger begets many faults: by thinking about the unworthiness of the one who affronted him, one works up *indignation;* by devising modes of getting even, he falls into *swelling of the mind.* Speech can become disorderly or confused: mere *ranting* or even injurious to God (*blasphemy*) or to the neighbor (*contumely*). Angry deeds can lead to *fights.*

The will's passionless movement, seeking that evil be punished, is reasonable and virtuous. A natural consequence of this is anger. A total lack of anger, therefore, would denote a slackness of the will and accordingly would be vicious.

Cruelty is opposed to clemency as the raw to the smooth. It is not the same as bestiality since it is a human vice: for it exceeds in punishing.

Wherever a virtue arises to regulate man's life in a *more* difficult sphere, another is required to dispose him in the *less* difficult. Temperance does the former, restraining the desires for the pleasures of food and sex. The following series of virtues, which some authors comprise under Modesty, moderate man's desire for good in the less difficult fields. *Humility* restrains the movement of the soul toward some excellence. *Studiousness,* opposed to the vice of curiosity, regulates the desire for knowledge. *Gravity* and *Eutrapeleia* govern bodily motions and actions in seriousness and play, respectively. *Contentedness* and *Simplicity* are concerned with the desire for outward show in dress. We will say more about each of these virtues now.

The difficult good attracts as good, and arouses hope. This must be guarded against excess (presumption) by Humility. As difficult, it tends to cause despondency; this is corrected by Magnanimity.

Humility resides in the appetite wherein the movement to be restrained takes place. True, a knowledge of one's shortcomings is presupposed to enable one to refrain from aspiring to what is above him.

We ought to distinguish in ourselves what is from God: our good, and what is from ourselves: our sin. We ought put the neighbor above ourselves if we compare what he has from God with what we have from ourselves. But comparing what the neighbor has from God with what we have ourselves from God we need not prefer him. Nor need a man think that what good is his from himself is less than what all others have from themselves. Else each one would have to think himself the greatest sinner. Yet one may consider that some other has a gift from God which he has not, or is free of some defect from himself which he has from himself, and thus subject himself to him.

Any virtue which moderates impetuous motion is a potential part of temperance; this includes humility. Cicero lists this virtue which restrains hope as part of Modesty.

Humility has a special excellence, since it subjects man to legitimate ordinances in all things, whereas other virtues have a special subject matter. Hence after the theological virtues (more excellent in that they order man to the end), and after the infused virtues, especially Prudence (which regards reason itself) and Justice, especially Legal Justice (which directs man to the means to the end), Humility is first.

Humility makes a man fear God and bear all his commands in mind, for Humility shows reverence for God, in that one does not presume to aspire beyond his endowments. In order not to aim inordinately at one's own excellence, a man does not follow his own will; he regulates his conduct by his superior's judgment, and is not deterred by difficulties. Humility requires that one estimate his own deficiencies; this requires that he acknowledge and avow his shortcomings, and deem himself unworthy of (too) great things, and put others before himself. Outwardly Humility will appear by not departing from the ordinary way in one's work, in not being too quick to speak, or immoderate in speech, and by

avoiding haughty looks, checking laughter and other signs of senseless mirth.

Reason requires that a man tend to what is proportionate to him. Pride aspires inordinately at excellence, i.e., at excellence beyond one's reach, and so is a sin. As having this special object, Pride is a special sin. As spurring on to all vice, it is general, since any sin can be done out of contempt and so involve pride. But weakness also gives rise to some sins; hence not every sin always actually springs from pride.

One's own excellence (the object which pride seeks inordinately) is a good that is hard to attain. Hence Pride pertains to the irascible appetite of both the sense and the spirit, since its object is both sensible and intelligible.

False boasting betrays a tendency to what is above one's competence. To think of a good which one has from another (whether as efficient or meritorious cause) as if it were from himself, is making it greater than it is, and so belongs to Pride (False Attribution); by being singularly conspicuous, one—by the manner of possessing a good—may seek to excel unduly, and so be guilty of pride.

In itself Pride is a mortal sin, since it is against due subjection of self to God. Of course, if sufficient reflection or full consent be lacking, the sin is venial only. Every sin involves a conversion to a mutable good and an aversion from the Immutable: God. In the former way, Pride is not the most serious sin, since being excellent is a good; but in the latter way it is the most grave since, whereas other sins can occur through ignorance or weakness, Pride always occurs through unwillingness to subject oneself to God. It is evident, therefore, that Pride is the most serious of sins. Pride, too, by its nature causes an aversion from God: an essential to mortal sin. Hence Pride is the beginning of all sin. As a special vice, Pride is a capital one, since for its end other sins are committed. As exercising a general influence over all sins, it is the Queen of all the vices, even the capital ones.

Virtues deal with the matter that primarily concerns them. This in the case of studiousness is knowledge, since one seeks knowledge itself before seeking what is governed by knowledge.

Studiousness is a potential part of Temperance, to which it per-

tains to moderate the natural desire for good—in this case knowledge. Desire for knowledge is a desire for a good. But one can render it evil by taking pride in it or putting it to bad use. The desire for knowledge can be inordinate also if: (1) One seeks to know what is less profitable, to the neglect of what is obligatory: "We see priests forsaking the gospel and the prophets, reading stage plays and singing the love songs of pastoral idyls" (St. Jerome); (2) one seeks to learn from a forbidden teacher, v.g. the demons; (3) one seeks to know the truth about creatures without referring the knowledge to its due end, God; (4) when one seeks to know what exceeds his capacity, for thus many have fallen into error.

Seeking sensible knowledge can be sinful in two ways: first, by seeking it when it is useless or harmful; secondly by directing it to an evil end, v.g.—looking at a woman to promote lust, or minding other's affairs to contribute to detraction. But the ordinate seeking of sensible knowledge to sustain nature (by avoiding what is harmful and getting what the body needs), or for intelligible truth, is virtuous.

External movements are subject to virtue, since they are comprised within human matters which can be subjected to reason. Reason demands that such actions be adapted to other persons and to all external surroundings.

Weariness of the soul is induced by intense application, especially intellectual. This is dispelled by the soul's rest: pleasure. The soul's tension of study must be slackened by some pleasure. Words and deeds, wherein nothing else is sought but the soul's delight, pertain to play. Indecent and injurious games should be eschewed. Nor may one lose the balance of his mind altogether while at play. Circumstances of persons, time, place, etc. must be taken into account. A habit moderating the desire for Fun is a virtue: eutrapeleia or Playfulness.

If deeds or words cause serious injury to the neighbor, they are mortal sins; where circumstances make play unfitting, if one would persist even to the point of grievously offending God, a mortal sin occurs.

The lack of the proper spirit of playfulness is boorish. Here one neither contributes to mirth himself nor participates by approving the efforts of others. Yet a deficiency herein is less serious than

an excess, since relaxation exists for achievement. "A little sweetness suffices to season the whole of life."

One can be immoderate in using apparel: (1) by violating custom; (2) by excessive pleasure in the use of clothes due either to vainglory or excessive concern for the body's pleasure; (3) by too much solicitude about raiment. Hence humility to correct vainglory; Contentedness to see and be content with what is suitable; and Simplicity, which excludes excessive solicitude, are indicated here.

A deficiency in due concern in the use of clothes can occur: (1) by not enough care: effeminacy, and (2) by ostentatious neglect.

A woman may licitly adorn herself to please her husband. But to do so to gratify other men lustfully is a mortal sin; to dress to please other men out of mere frivolity or from vanity is not always a mortal sin, but is sometimes venial.

The end of the Commandments is Charity toward God and the neighbor. Intemperance through adultery seems most opposed to this. Hence the decalogue forbids it.

The virtues annexed to Temperance directly perfect oneself, and so are not immediately related to Charity toward God or the neighbor. But in their effects they can be; thus the lack of meekness can lead to murder or to disrespect toward one's parents. Again, lack of humility can cause disrespect of God or parent. These effects are punishable by divine law.

EDWARD J. MCNALLY, S.J.

Fordham University
New York, N. Y.

THE MORALITY OF NUCLEAR WARFARE

In recent times there has been a growing controversy over the complex problem of nuclear warfare in our time, and more precisely over the moral permissibility of the use of nuclear weapons. Many of the writers have expressed their conviction that, in view of the destructive power of the latest weapons, the use of such arms is clearly immoral and therefore never permissible. Others have considered international Communism, which is in possession of such weapons, and concluded that it would inevitably take advantage of unilateral rejection of nuclear weapons and freely pursue its destructive aims.

In view of the actuality of these problems, it is appropriate to make a re-examination of the principles of moral philosophy concerning war, particularly in regard to a war with nuclear weapons. In this evaluation, world Communism, with its aggressive tendencies and false pacifist pretentions, must also be taken into our consideration.

Concerning the morality of war, a system of sound principles is now commonly professed by moralists. Civilized nations accept, at least theoretically, most of these principles on the basis of international agreements. These principles are based on natural law and on divine Revelation.

Peace founded on justice is a basic tenet of divine Revelation. Particularly the New Testament stresses peace among nations. If nations live in accordance with the doctrine of divine revelation, there will be no wars. But wars do exist, because nations do not observe the rules of justice, just as they reject the rule of Christ.

An aggressive war of conquest is plainly unjust. On the other hand, an attacked nation has the right to defend itself against an unjust aggressor. In modern times war, be it aggressive or defensive, involves the killing not only of combatants but also of non-combatants, with the concurrent destruction of non-military objectives.

War is permitted only as an evil side-effect in pursuing a just cause of defending the violated rights of a nation and of establishing a just peace.

The accepted principles of individual self-defense against an unjust aggressor are often taken as an analogy in evaluating the morality of war. A man can defend himself, his family, or his property by disabling and under specific circumstances even by killing an unjust aggressor. But his direct intention must be to defend his right, and not to kill the attacker. He can only permit injury to an aggressor as an incidental concurrence which cannot be avoided. If he can preserve his rights by less harmful means than by killing, he must use these means. It must be certain that the aggressor is unjust; the mere probability does not suffice to injure or kill the suspect. There must also be proportion between permitting the injury to the unjust aggressor and the violation of another's rights. A man can injure and eventually kill only in defending a property substantially needed for his subsistence, not an insignificant property.

Applying these principles to our subject, it can be summarized:

(1) Only a *just* war is permitted on the basis of sound moral principles. There must be a certainty about the justice of the case of war. There must be positive infringements upon specific rights of a nation. Unprovoked *aggression* by a nation is a case that clearly justifies a war of self-defense.

(2) If possible, negotiations for peaceful settlement of the case should be applied before taking recourse to war.

(3) If negotiations fail, war can be proclaimed, and that by the lawful authority of the wronged nation.

(4) Upon proclaiming war, there must be a hope that, by the war, violated rights will be vindicated, betterment of the situation achieved, and just peace restored.

(5) Destructive weapons can be used only against military or predominantly military objectives. Injury to non-combatants and the destruction of non-military objects are permitted only if they occur as incidental side-effects, connected with the pursuit of war against military objectives. There must be a proportionate reason for permitting injury to non-combatants.

(6) Additional humanitarian rules concerning the conduct of war, agreed upon by participating nations, must be carried out.

NUCLEAR WARFARE

The atomic age is producing incomparably superior weapons of enormous destructive power. In fact, the Hydrogen bomb with Cobalt covering (the C-bomb) has unlimited potential of destruction, which can not be properly controlled. Launching of such bombs by intercontinental ballistic missiles is considered as the ultimate in the future war.

While the biggest bombs used in the last World War had maximum destructive power of eleven tons of TNT, the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were equal to 22,000 tons of TNT. The latest H-bombs supposedly have a thousand times higher explosive power than the first atomic bombs. Combined with enormously radioactive Cobalt, their destructive power is practically unlimited. While the A-bomb directly devastated an area of four square miles, the relatively small H-bomb of five megatons of TNT can directly devastate an area of about 150 square miles, while an area of 800 square miles would be subject to the fatal effects of scorching heat. Further damage would be produced by radioactive fallout throughout an area of about 7,000 square miles, with long-lasting effects, caused by radioactive contamination of air, water and food.

In the event of all-out nuclear war, the destructive effects are incalculable. The existence of all forms of higher life would be at stake. Those living creatures not directly destroyed would probably be rendered sterile.

With these prospects in mind, it is clear that a re-examination of the permissibility of war is necessary.

The principles of morality do not change. They are perennial. However, the technical progress resulting in super-means of destruction is the reality that makes the application of moral principles concerning war a very intricate matter.

In applying the principles to new realities, first of all a radical distinction must be made between controllable and uncontrollable nuclear weapons, that is, between an A- or H-bomb with limited power and an open C-bomb.

It is simply not allowed, under any circumstances, to destroy the human race or put at stake its existence. Pope Pius XII, speaking to the Eighth Congress of the World Medical Associa-

tion, on September 30, 1954, stated in this connection: "Should the use of this method [atomic, biological, or chemical warfare] entail such an extension of the existing evil as would render war wholly incapable of controlling it, its use should be rejected as immoral. In such an instance it would no longer be a question of 'defense' against injustice, and of necessary 'safeguarding' of legitimate possessions, but of the pure and simple annihilation of all human life within the radius of action. Under no circumstances is this to be permitted." [1]

It is clear that the use of uncontrollable nuclear weapons, which would endanger the existence of the human race on the earth or in a vast area of the earth, is not permissible on the basis of sound morality. Thus the use of an uncontrollable C-bomb should be considered as not permissible. Similarly, the A- and H-bombs of limited potential, used in such an amount that their cumulative effect would result in endangering the existence of mankind, cannot be permitted.

What remains to solve is the question of the permissibility of nuclear war not endangering the existence of mankind.

The atomic age is still in its cradle. Not all the facts, particularly about the long-lasting effects of radioactivity, are known. Some facts, for security reasons, are veiled in secrecy. There is, however, no doubt about the enormous destructive potential of even relatively small nuclear weapons, and about the hazard of continuous accumulation of radioactivity.

This scarcity of reliable data about the exact nature of nuclear weapons explains to some extent the diversity of opinions among Catholic moralists.

Cardinal William Godfrey, Archbishop of Westminster, in his Easter sermon in 1958 made the following statement:

"We do not believe that it has yet been conclusively shown that there can be no conceivable circumstance in which there might be a legitimate target for even the most powerful nuclear weapons."[2]

Fr. John C. Ford, S.J., professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of America, in a discussion on the subject at John Carroll University in 1956, reached an opposite conclusion, namely that in present conditions, there can not be found a suffi-

[1] Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks* (1954), p. 349.
[2] John C. Ford, S.J., *America* (1958), p. 188.

ciently big target for a legitimate use of large H-bombs. Such bombs would always affect a preponderantly civilian populace. Therefore, according to Father Ford, the use of such bombs is not permissible.[3]

The late Pius XII devoted much attention to the problem of peace and war in this atomic age. Notified about the efforts of scientists to apply atomic energy for powerful weapons, Pope Pius XII, as early as in 1943, warned against it and recommended the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. Although his warnings were not heeded, the Holy Father did not desist from exhorting nations to renounce further experiments with nuclear weapons, to proscribe such arms, and to reduce armaments in general, and that on the basis of international agreements and with an effective international inspection.[4]

However, he never simply rejected the use of nuclear weapons with limited destructive power as absolutely non-permissible. Speaking to the Sixth Congress of Penal Law, on October 3, 1953, he answered the question about the permissibility of atomic, biological, and chemical warfare: "The answer may be deduced from the same principles which are decisive today for permitting war in general." [5]

Explaining these principles in his Christmas message on December 23, 1956, the Holy Father stated: "It is clear that in the present circumstances there can be verified in a nation the situation wherein, every effort to avoid war being expended in vain, war for effective self-defense, and with the hope of favorable outcome against unjust attack, could not be considered unlawful." [6] And in his Address to Women Army-Auxiliaries, on May 21, 1958, he said: "Although the Church refuses to accept any doctrine which claims that war is a necessary effect of cosmic, physical, or economic forces, it is equally adverse to admitting that war is always censurable."[7]

[3] John C. Ford, S.J., *Theology Digest* (1957), pp. 6-9.

[4] Pius XII, "Address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences," Feb. 8, 1948; "Christmas Message," 1951; "Easter Address," 1955; "Christmas Message," 1955; etc.

[5] Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks* (1954), p. 355.

[6] Pius XII, *The Catholic Mind* (1957), p. 178.

[7] Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks* (1958), p. 41.

According to sound moral principles, in any war there must be proportion between the violation of national rights and the punitive measures used for the vindication of these rights. In nuclear war, there should be proportion between the dreadful effects of nuclear bombing and the violation of national rights.

What kind of violated rights could be vindicated by controllable nuclear weapons?

In his address to the Sixth Congress of Penal Law, on October 3, 1953, Pius XII stated: "Defense against *any* injustice whatever is not sufficient reason for a nation to have recourse to the violent method of war. When the harm wrought by war is not comparable to that caused by 'tolerating injustice,' one may be obliged to 'suffer injustice.'" [8]

Thus not for violation of national rights alone is it permitted to use dreadful nuclear weapons, the most violent method of war we can think of. The *preservation of a nation* in its physical or moral structures can safely be said to be the *only* sufficient reason for using controllable nuclear weapons in a war of self-defense.

The safeguarding of democratic institutions founded on principles of Christian morality, confronted with an unprovoked aggression by a tyrannical system trying to impose itself upon a free nation, would be a just cause for using limited nuclear weapons against the military objectives of such an aggressor. Democratic freedoms are the core of a decent, human, and orderly life in free countries. With the destruction of these freedoms, the economic, political and moral structures of a nation fall, and that means the destruction of a nation as such.

A person may ask what could be done in the event that a tyrannical aggressor, disregarding the principles of morality, launches a war with the open C-bombs or enormously powerful H-bombs. In such a case, there *could* be *no* hope for repudiation of the aggressor and an effective self-defense through the use of conventional or nuclear weapons with limited destructive power. Would it be permitted, then, to retaliate with the kind of weapons used by the unjust aggressor? Or rather, avoiding the recourse to illicit means and lacking the hope for the betterment of the situation through licit means, should the attacked nation renounce

[8] Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks* (1954), p. 355.

all self-defense? A crucial question, indeed. It may be answered with a statement made by Father Ford: "But if that were the dilemma, I would consider that we had arrived at the point where absolute moral imperatives were at stake, and that the followers of Christ should abandon themselves to divine Providence rather than forsake these imperatives." [9]

It is quite clear that the discussion about the morality of nuclear warfare is not something purely theoretical. Nuclear weapons are a dreadful reality. Equally known is the division of the world into two opposing camps, the Communist and the Democratic worlds. The cold war has surged forth again. As long as the causes of the cold war are not removed, it can flare up into a shooting war at any time.

Communism does not have much of moral inhibitions. Whatever serves the cause of world Communism is considered morally licit and commendable. World Commnism, as long as it holds to its original structure, has for its ultimate end the conquest of the world and the imposing of its tyrannical and atheistic system on mankind either by outright war or by subversion. The Communists, as they made themselves known, would hardly have any compunction in using nuclear weapons, if they did not fear the deadly consequences of retaliation in kind and the boomerang effects of fallout from their own weapons. The American stockpile of nuclear weapons seems to be the only deterrent against Communist aggressive plans.

Pacifism is one of the weapons in the mastery of deceit, which they practice so successfully. The end of experiments with nuclear weapons, a ban on all nuclear bombs, and subsequent disarmament have been repeatedly stressed by Communist diplomats as a basis for the settlement of international tensions. But whenever it comes to the question of effective international inspection of their fulfilment of such agreements, the Communists consistently reject it, thus clearly manifesting their insincerity. They seem to demand unilateral disarmament, disarmament of the Democratic world, without giving, as yet, a sufficient guarantee that they, too, will disarm.

[9] John C. Ford, S.J., *Theology Digest* (1957), p. 9.

These realities, however, do not change the principles concerning the moral permissibility of nuclear warfare and the moral conduct of such war. Still, in examining the morality of war in our time, all these facts must be taken into consideration. To simply state that all nuclear weapons are morally illicit, would be incorrect on the basis of sound moral principles, and could give a new incentive to unscrupulous Communism to freely pursue its destructive aims.

According to sound moral principles and the clear pronouncements of Pope Pius XII, the war which would put at stake the existence of mankind is never permissible. On the other hand, a war with nuclear weapons of limited destructive power can be permitted under fixed conditions of permissibility of war in general. But these conditions must be verified in all details.

The risks connected with even a limited nuclear war are enormous Therefore, all morally acceptable means leading to the solution of current international problems should be applied.

To us Christians, the dreadful realities of stockpiled nuclear weapons in both camps of the cold war should be an invitation for redoubling our prayers that the principles of sound morality prevail on both sides, particularly on the side of materialistic Communism, and that a reasonable solution of imminent problems be found for the benefit of all mankind.

THEODORE J. ZUBEK, O.F.M.

Clifton, N. J.

...OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE CHURCH AS MOTHER

Of the many figures under which the Church is described in Scripture and Tradition one has held a central position in the consideration of theologians in recent years and that is the Body of Christ.[1] On the other hand, there is another image which is equally classical but which has become for the most part a bloodless metaphor, evoking only a vague image in the mind. This is the figure of the Church as Mother: *mater ecclesia.* Theologians and patristic scholars, however, have tried to rescue the figure from the limbo of colorless expressions and to restore life to it, by investigating its origin, its history in patristic thought and its ecclesiological implications. The present article in synthesizing the results of these investigations will offer an evaluation of the motherhood concept through a comparison with other figures traditionally used to designate the mysterious reality of the Church.

The full development of the *mater ecclesia* figure occurred in the patristic period, although prototypes may be found in the biblical tradition.[2] Tracing the history of the growth of the figure, Plumpe has noticed two branches of development.[3] On the one hand, the Church is represented in a concrete realistic fashion as possessing all the qualities associated with natural motherhood. St. Cyprian is the best example of this method of developing the Church's motherhood. The African Father paints the Church vividly and graphically, his bold imagery stirring the imagination until there emerges into being a mother, alive, pulsating with alternate emotions of grief and joy.[4]

On the other hand, there is a more allegorical and mystical

[1] Foremost among these is, of course, E. Mersch, *Le corps mystique du Christ* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1936); see the bibliography collected by J. Bluett, "The Mystical Body of Christ: 1890-1940," *Theological Studies,* III (1942), 260-289.

[2] *Gal.* 4:22-31 is a *locus classicus* for the Fathers in speaking of the motherhood of the Church. See also *Eph.* 5:25-28; *John* 3:29; *Luke* 34-35.

[3] Joseph C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia: An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 125. The translations of passages from the Fathers used in this article are taken from Plumpe.

[4] See the examples quoted below.

approach to the Church's motherhood. This approach may be illustrated from St. Methodius. According to the latter: as Adam was created without seed—out of the earth, virginal and untouched by the plow—so Christ, the Second Adam, is formed and united to the *Logos* in the chaste womb of the Virgin Mother. Because the first Adam sinned, God desired to recreate him in the Incarnation. As Eve was formed from the side of Adam, so the Church was born from the pierced side of Christ on the cross, and just as Adam and Eve were one in the flesh from the moment of Eve's coming into being, so too were Christ and the Church joined in marriage as the latter came into being. In each baptism Christ comes down again to "recapitulate" His passion and the sleep of death. It is during this sleep that the Church, the Second Eve, is taken from His side. In this act the Second Adam and the Second Eve are wed, in this act they consummate their nuptials; we are born and the Church becomes Mother Church.[5]

No attempt will be made here to follow the historical development of the figure of the Church's motherhood. Rather it will suffice to analyze the content of the figure, and to illustrate by quotations from some of the Fathers of the Church the various elements which go to make it up. First, Mother Church is considered a *Virgo Mater* because she is free from the slightest taint of heresy and her teaching is pure and undefiled by false doctrine. Thus Clement of Alexandria speaks of her in the middle section of his great trilogy, the *Paedagogus:*

> O wondrous mystery! One is the Father of all, one also the Logos of all, and the Holy Spirit is one and the same everywhere, and there is only one *Virgin Mother;* I love to call her the *Church.* . . . She is both *virgin and mother, being undefiled as a virgin and loving as a mother; and calling her children to her, she nurses them with holy milk, the Logos for children.*[6]

[5] *Symposium: A Treatise on Chastity:* Plumpe, *op. cit.,* p. 111. For an almost identical allegory see Tertullian, "De Anima," 43: *CSEL* 20, 372, 2-5, and St. Augustine, *In. Jn. tr. IX,* n. 10. Extensive patristic evidence for the concept of the Church originating from the pierced side of Christ on the cross has been admirably presented by S. Tromp, "De Nativitate Ecclesiae ex Corde Jesu in Cruce," *Gregorianum,* XIII (1932), 489-527. For a comparison of the side of Christ and the heart of Christ as symbols see the article of P. de Broglie, "L'Église, nouvelle Eve, née du Sacre-Coeur," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* LXXVIII (1946), 3-25.

[6] *Paed.* 1, 6, 42: Plumpe, *op. cit.,* 65.

The text comments on the two aspects of the church as virgin and mother: virgin because she is undefiled by heresy, a mother because she is affectionate and loving. So too St. Ambrose beholds the church as a virgin mother: "It is a virgin who has borne us in her womb, a virgin who has brought us forth, a virgin who has nourished us with her own milk."[7]

A conflict of metaphors here between the Church as *mater* and as *virgin* is not to be supposed. She is a *virgin* in so far as she is free from the taint of heresy and because she conceives us *semine spirituali.* As St. Augustine has said so pointedly: "Christ has granted to the Church in spirit that which his mother had in body, to be at once a mother and a virgin."[8]

Though virgin, the Church is also *Sponsa Christi* as St. Cyprian calls her in the celebrated passage of his *De Unitate Ecclesiae:*

> She, the *Bride of Christ,* cannot be adulterous; she is untainted and chaste. She knows only one home, the sanctity of one bedchamber she guards with chaste modesty. She it is that keeps us unharmed for God, she appoints the *sons* she has begotten to His kingdom. Whosoever separates himself from the Church and attaches himself to an adulteress, separates himself from the promises of the Church, nor will he who leaves the Church, attain to the rewards of Christ. He is a stranger, he is unholy, he is an enemy. *He cannot have God for father, who has not the Church for mother.*[9]

The Church as Bride of Christ is beloved by Christ her Spouse with a conjugal love. That love is primarily orientated to the generation of children, that is, to the salvation of souls. Consequently,

[7] *De Officiis Ministrorum,* Lib. I, c. 5, 22.

[8] *Sermon* LXXXVIII, 9. An excellent treatment of the mentality of the early Christians with regard to the Church as virgin may be found in A. M. Henry, "Eve, L'Église et Marie," *La Sainte Vierge: Figure de l'église* (Cahiers de la vie spirituelle, Paris, 1945), 107-108, n. 13. The parallel between Mary and the Church by reason of their virginity, their motherhood, their sanctity, and their espousal to Christ did not escape the Fathers. The evidence has been collected by various scholars including George Montagne, "The Concept of Mary and the Church in the Fathers," *American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXIII (1950), 331-337.

[9] *De Unitate Ecclesiae 6: CSEL* 214, 17-24 H: Plumpe, *op. cit.,* 90. Claude Chavasse treats extensively of St. Augustine's development of the theme of the Church as the Bride of Christ in his work: *The Bride of Christ: An Enquiry into the Nuptial Element in Early Christianity* (London: Faber & Faber, 1940), pp. 135-160.

the Church conceives her children *semine spirituali.* This seed is either the Holy Spirit,[10] or the doctrine which she received from Christ,[11] or both.[12] Her children she begets in baptism.[13] By her these are nourished with the milk of faith[14] through her preaching, her laws, her exhortations and, above all, the sacraments, particularly the Holy Eucharist.[15]

Mater Ecclesia is sometimes said to be without spot or wrinkle. Yet the obvious presence of sinners within the Church would seem to conflict with this statement. The expression, it is true, must be correctly understood. St. Augustine in his *Retractions* says that although he has often spoken of the Church as spotless, this should not be taken to mean that she is already that.[16] Because of the weakness and ignorance of her members the entire Church cries out: "Dimitte nobis debita nostra." Here on earth the Church cannot be said to be *sine macula* because of the sins of her children. St. Augustine, however, considers the entire Church as a holy and chaste virgin, in whom, however, the impulses of nature and the impulses of the spirit are at war with one another, according to *Gal.* 5:17. Nature is at war with the spirit because of the sins of the members of the Church, while the spirit is at war with nature because the earthly Church no less than the heavenly one does not love the evil desires of the members but represses them. These

[10] Clem. Alex., *Cohort.* 1: *MG* 8, 65-67; Origen, *In Cant.* prol: *MG* 13, 72; Leon Magn., *Serm.* 63, 6: *ML* 54, 356.

[11] Cf. Orig., *In Cant.* prol.: *MG* 13, 72; Gregor. Nyss., *Or. in Resurr. Christi* 1: *MG* 46, 604; Theodor., *In Cant.* I., 15-16: *MG* 81, 84-85.

[12] Cf. Gregor. Magn., *Mor.* XIX, 12, 19: *ML* 76, 108 and Ambros., *In Lc.* III, 38: *ML* 15, 1607.

[13] August., *Epist.* 34, 3: *ML* 33, 132; *Sermon* CCXVI, 7; *Sermon* LVI; *Enarr.* V, 8; *Enarr.* LVII, 5; Origen, *Exp. in Prov: MG,* 17, 209B. St. Augustine spoke of *Mater Ecclesia* especially to catechumens and the newly baptized. See F. Hofmann, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus . . .* (München: Max Hueber, 1933), p. 264 and P. Batiffol, *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin* (Paris: Gabalda, 1920), pp. 269-276.

[14] Iren., *Adv. Haer.* 3, 24, 1 and 5, 20, 2: *MG* 7, 966 and 1178; Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1, 6: *MG* 8, 303; Greg. Nyss., *Or. in Resurr. Christi* 1: *MG* 46, 604; Aug., *Epist.* 243, 8: *ML* 33, 1057.

[15] Aug. *Epist.* 34, 3: *ML* 33, 132; Clement Alex., *Paed.* 1, 6: *MG* 8, 300, 305, 307; Chrysost., *Qual. duc. uxor., MG* 51, 229.

[16] *Retract.* 2, 18: *ML* 32, 637-638. See S. Tromp, "Ecclesia Sponsa Virgo Mater," *Gregorianum,* XVIII (1937), 26-27.

desires are involuntary and consequently, though the spouse is not without stain, yet she is holy.[17]

It is evident, then, that the Church as Mother is considered to be in some sense distinct from her children. For example, in the *Symposium* of St. Methodius of Philippi, Thecla, one of the speakers, interprets the celebrated vision of the Woman and the Dragon in the *Apocalypse* of St. John (12, 1-6) in a way that brings out this distinction.

> The woman that appeared in heaven clothed with the sun and bearing a crown of twelve stars and having the moon for her footstool, the woman that is in travail and pain of child-birth, this, my dear maidens, by precise interpretation certainly is *our Mother, being a power by herself and distinct from her children.* Her have the prophets, envisaging the future, called sometimes Jerusalem, sometimes a bride, sometimes Mount Sion, sometimes the temple and tabernacle of God. The power, too, that is called upon in the prophet to give light, . . . is the *Church;* and in all haste her children will come to her from everywhere, they will run to her, seeking their resurrection in baptism.[18]

The Church is a vibrant, living mother, pulsating with maternal emotions of joy and sorrow. The pain and travail which accompany her *parturitio filiorum* does not end when men become Christians; she remains in labor throughout their lives.[19] When the scourge of Decian's methodically planned persecution fell over Africa in 250, Cyprian wrote to the imprisoned to follow the example of Mappalicus, one of the outstanding martyrs, and that of his companions:

> . . . that those who were united by the bond of confession and lodg-

[17] S. August., *De abstin.* 11, 25: *ML* 40, 366 and Tromp, *ibid.*

[18] *Symposium* 8, 5, 183 f.; Plumpe, *op. cit.*, p. 118. Elsewhere in the *Symposium,* according to H. Musurillo, the Church as spouse and mother refers specifically to the more perfect members: "all those who have perfect faith and are purified from the evils of the flesh. . . . It is they who preach to 'the imperfect' and 'bring them forth' as true members of the Church by virtue and holiness." Cf. *St. Methodius: The Symposium* (Ancient Christian Writers, No. 27, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1958), p. 202.

[19] The idea of the ceaseless labor of Mother Church in the continued re-conception and regeneration of her children has been aptly stated by F. Jürgensmeier, *Der Mystische Leib Christi* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1936), p. 305: "Just as St. Paul, so does the Church, the mother of the mystical members of Christ, suffer the pains of birth over her children in order, ever again, to bring them forth anew for Christ."

ment in prison, may be united likewise in the consummation of their valor and by a celestial crown; that by your enthusiasm you may wipe dry the tears of Mother Church, who is in mourning over the prostration and death of very many; and that by the provocation of your example, you may strengthen the determination of the others, too, who are standing upright.[20]

When the persecution ceased, St. Cyprian would write from exile a glowing encomium of the faithful confessors, in which he imagines the exulting mother receiving the battle-scarred sons back from the fray:

With what joy Mother Church takes you to her bosom as you return from the battle! How blissfully happy she is, as she opens her portals that you may enter in united ranks, bearing the trophies of victory from a prostrate enemy![21]

Further refinements are introduced into the figure of the Church's motherhood by the Fathers so that a division results which corresponds to the modern distinction of the *Ecclesia docens,* the *Ecclesia discens* and the *Ecclesia simpliciter.*[22] Thus (1) the *Sponsa Christi* is restricted to the hierarchy; (2) she is identified with the faithful; or (3) she is the faithful and the hierarchy together, the more perfect and distinguished members of which are the hierarchy.

This brief survey of the content of the expression, *Mater Ecclesia,* as it has appeared in Tradition places one in a position to compare the term with other figures that are found in Scripture and Tradition. The importance of such a procedure is clear upon reflection, for each expression represents but one aspect of a reality, a single facet which should be completed by a view of the others if the object is to be grasped as a whole. Moreover, no one expression nor all together completely expresses the richness of the Church which is both a visible reality and a mystery surpassing its outward manifestations.[23]

[20] *Epist.* 4: *op. cit.,* 494, 166; Plumpe, *op. cit.,* 83.

[21] *De Lapsis* 2: *Floriegium Patristicum* 21, 9, 2-5 Martin; Plumpe, *op. cit.,* 87.

[22] Tromp, "Ecclesia Sponsa Virgo Mater," *op. cit.,* 23-25.

[23] Yves de Montcheuil, *Aspects de L'Église* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1949), p. 21: ". . . each of these expressions indicates precisely only one aspect of the reality, which, under the risk of error, must be completed by the others."

The Body figure shows us a supernatural vital union of the faithful with Christ and with each other, their existing unity, their diversity in function and their constitutional identity with the Body of Christ. [24] The Church is also a *people,* an expression which stresses rather the personal character of the relations existing among the members yet simultaneously indicating that its harmony is not imposed from without but proceeds from freedom and deliberation. Because of Christ's presence in the Church, because in it and by it alone there is offered to God an authentic sacrifice pleasing in His sight, the Church is a *temple,* built of living stones. Being the fulfillment of the divine plan which unrolled in time from the creation of the world and whose essential element was the choice of a people as the bearer of a divine message, she is the *new Israel,* of which the first was only a figure. In her are found the first fruits of the eternal riches and hence she is the *Kingdom of God* upon earth.

The figure, *Mater Ecclesia,* like the other figures, indicates the visible external reality of the Church. Yet the other figures do not consider the spiritual generation and development of the members. The corporate development of the Body unto fulness is, of course, implied in the Body figure, but the *mater* figure shows that it is from the Church that each member derives a new life, nourishment, enlightenment, growth, forgiveness, and love. This is no weak analogue to natural motherhood; it expresses a relationship no less real and true than that of a natural mother to the children she has borne. In its own way this relationship is as real and objective as the real presence of the God-man in the Eucharist, with which she nourishes her children. As mother she stamps on their forehead the seal of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of Confirmation to strengthen them for battle. As mother she washes her children clean from the stain of sin. Because she is conceived as in some way distinct from her children, the *mater ecclesia* most aptly emphasizes that mysterious paradox that the Church is intrinsically holy despite the reality of sin in her children, that somehow

[24] The figure of the Vine and the Branches also expresses the vital union between Christ and the members of the Church; yet it does not seem to add any new note not already contained in the image of the body. The birth of new members implied by the growth of new branches links it somewhat to the *mater ecclesia* figure.

or other sin does not bear the same relation to her as does holiness, that it can never touch her in her innermost being.[25] She has been the ever-fruitful mother of saints, the holy Church, the Bride of Christ whose holiness is the assurance that she will one day be the Bride who can enter without spot or wrinkle into the wedding feast of the Lamb.

Thus, in the words of Scheeben, "This maternity is the basis of all the other social relations and activities which regulate and shape the Church in the unfolding of its life."[26] She must fashion Christ in her children, conform them to Christ, build them up to the full measure of the stature of Christ. When they stray, in sorrow and pain, she labors to bring them back. She educates them especially concerning supernatural truths, initiating them into the mysteries of God, of their own supernatural nobility and destiny. Consequently she is solicitous to preserve herself a virgin by the purity of her doctrine.

Thus the maternity of the Church implies the distinction of terms between the Bride and the Groom while insisting on a quasi-physical union analogous to the marriage union. Furthermore it indicates that the union is motivated by *love,* an aspect not so vividly highlighted in the figures of the temple of God, the people, or the Body. Here one can observe a sort of gradation in metaphors. The *templum* and *ecclesia* figures are static and correspond with the level of non-living reality; the body metaphor emphasizes the vitality of the union and corresponds with the level of living beings; the *populus Dei* implies personal relations on the level of society; the *Mater Ecclesia* stresses those personal relationships proper to the most intimate of human unions, a union of love.

Is it not true, as Fr. Henry has pointed out, that we are a bit disconcerted by this image of the Church as Spouse of Christ, the second Eve, the new mother of the living?[27] So accustomed have we become to considering the Church in its hierarchy, its laws and its social structure that we no longer look upon it as a living person.

[25] On the problem of the co-existence of sin and holiness in the Church one may consult the excellent article of Karl Rahner, "The Church of Sinners," *Cross Currents,* I (Spring, 1951), 64-74.

[26] *The Mysteries of Christianity,* tr. by Cyril Vollert (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1946), p. 548.

[27] A. M. Henry, "Eve, L'Église et Marie," *op. cit.,* 106.

We do not have the feeling that we are dealing with a mother who gives us life, protects us from innumerable dangers from without, and who sanctifies us. Yet one has merely to read the Patristic Commentaries on Scripture to realize that the Church for them was not so much a thing as a living person. *Mater Ecclesia* is not for them a rhetorical figure of speech; it is a living being, a mother, the Spouse of Christ who feeds, nourishes and protects her children. Filial love consequently would prompt her children to preserve her free from the contamination of pagan vices and the taint of heresy, which seemed to press in upon her from all sides. It was natural, then, for them to view her as a virgin.

The image, *Mater Ecclesia,* not only stands for the reality of the Church, it contains a rich theological content as well. The relationship between the maternity of the Church and its jurisdictional organization has been elaborated upon, in recent times, by Scheeben, who has developed in remarkable fashion the patristic tradition of the maternity of the Church in her priesthood.[28] Still more recently the eminent French theologian, Henri de Lubac, has written affectionately of the filial attitudes, particularly that of obedience, which the Catholic intellectual should foster and maintain toward this great and venerable Mother.[29] This renewed interest in recapturing and further enriching the meaning and significance of the Church as Mother should eventually divest the figure of any pietistic, sentimental connotation with which it may have become sugar-coated because its implications and original significance had become lost or obscured.

VINCENT F. BLEHL, S.J.

Canisius College
Buffalo, New York

[28] *Ibid.,* 545-553.

[29] Henri de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church,* tr. by Michael Mason (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp. 174-207.

Answers to Questions

NUPTIAL BLESSING

Question: After receiving a married woman convert into the Church, should I apply to my bishop for permission to give her the Nuptial Blessing outside of Mass, or may it be given to her, without the bishop's permission, while saying the Mass of the day?

Answer: Presuming that the husband is a Catholic, I would say that either possibility is open to you. The mind of the Church is in favor of giving the blessing within Mass. As you acknowledge, to give it outside Mass would require recourse to the Ordinary who can grant the indult by virtue of his Quinquennial Faculties. Both parties, of course, must be present.

FUNERAL ABSOLUTION PROBLEMS

Question 1: If a residential Bishop who has assisted at a Solemn Requiem Mass in mozzetta gives the Absolution afterwards, should he be assisted at the Absolution by the deacon of the Mass or by his chaplains? In this circumstance should *"Anima eius, etc."* be added at the end of the Absolution? Should the cantors or the deacon sing the final *"Requiescat in pace"* at the end of the Absolution?

Answer 1: Since an indult is required for a residential Bishop to assist at the throne in mozzetta, books of ceremonies rarely envision the situation. But the directions given for this ceremony, when the Bishop has assisted in cappa, would answer your problem. The eleventh and latest edition of G. Baldeschi, *Sacre Cerimonie* (Rome, 1959), pp. 510-511, describes the Bishop as accompanied to the place of Absolution by his chaplains. The same text does not specify who sings the *"Requiescat in pace"* but tells us that, after it, the Bishop merely makes the sign of the cross, then sits to receive the mitre in preparation for his departure. Martinucci says that the cantors sing the *"Requiescat"* and continues: "the Bishop, not adding a word, will make the sign of the cross in the

direction of the bier . . . and will sit." Baldeschi is just as specific as Martinucci about this part of the ceremony when he is describing an Absolution given by a Bishop who has offered the Requiem Mass (pp. 383-384).

Question 2: At the end of the Absolution following a Solemn Requiem Mass, is the procession led by the subdeacon and acolytes or by the thurifer and holy water bearer?

Answer 2: The subdeacon and acolytes lead the procession to the sacristy, followed immediately by the thurifer and holy water bearer (cf. Baldeschi, *op. cit.*, p. 165).

SOLEMN MASS PROCESSION

Question: At the beginning of Solemn Mass should the thurifer or acolytes lead the procession to the altar?

Answer: If there is an Asperges, the thurifer will serve as the holy water bearer and will lead the procession. After the Asperges, he will return to the sacristy with the holy water and then come back immediately to the sanctuary with the thurible and incense boat. If there is no Asperges, the authors of books of ceremonies differ. Martinucci, for example, has the thurifer lead the procession, with folded hands. After the genuflection at the altar, he goes to the credence table to prepare the thurible which is there. O'Connell-Schmitz have him lead the procession, with the thurible. Baldeschi says he can lead the procession with the thurible already prepared or he can enter with those who are going to be in choir and, when the ministers genuflect at the altar, he goes to the sacristy and returns with the thurible. Because of the short interval between the time the ministers arrive at the altar and the incensing, the practical solution is to have the thurifer lead the procession, carrying the thurible with a well lighted charcoal therein. This last point, so obvious, is too often overlooked.

VESTED CRUCIFIX

Question: In one of our many chapels, where we say Mass to renew the Species, there is a crucifix with Christ clothed in a chasuble. This is the altar crucifix, not merely hanging on one of the walls. Personally, I believe this is wrong but know not why.

Could you please help this chaplain, or am I wrong in holding that such is not the proper altar crucific?

Answer: Father John H. Miller, C.S.C., in his recently published *Fundamentals of the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides, 1959), p. 109, says about the crucifix which later became the altar crucifix: "Long before the cross took its place upon the altar-table, there hung a cross from the ceiling of the church, usually between the apse and the nave. Sometimes it was simply a cross without the image of the crucified; sometimes it was covered with gems, the *crux gemmata.* Often, after Christians began to depict the Savior nailed to the cross, His image was vested in regal or priestly robes, and a crown of jewels was placed on His head. It was relatively late that the sufferings of the Savior were brought out in all their striking realism; this was done about the thirteenth century, the age of the Passion mystics. . . . The first time there is mention of an obligation to have a crucifix on the altar is in the Roman Missal of Pius V in 1570. This is still required. . . . After the appearance of the encyclical *Mediator Dei* some have thought that the so-called Christ the King crucifix was forbidden, since the Pope says, 'one would be straying from the straight path were he to . . . order the crucifix so designed that the divine Redeemer's body shows no trace of His cruel sufferings' (par. 62). But as long as such a crucifix allows the wounds in the hands and feet to be visible, it is still in accord with the Pope's wishes."

CHALICE IN THE HANDS OF A DECEASED PRIEST

Question: When a priest lies in state in the church, is it wrong for a chalice to be placed in his hands, to be removed when the casket is closed after the Office for the Dead or after the funeral service?

Answer: The *Roman Ritual* (*Tit. VI,* C. 1, 12-13; New York, 1944) describes the preparation of a priest for burial. There is no mention of a chalice. Although there was a custom in some places of putting a chalice in the hands of a deceased priest lying in state, it has, I believe, been pretty well abandoned. Practical considerations, among them the gruesome distortion of the stiffened hands when the chalice is removed, have weighed heavily against the custom, which was in poor taste in the first place.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

THE MORALITY OF OVULATION REBOUND

Question: Please discuss the physical and moral aspects of what is called "ovulation rebound."

Answer: To understand "ovulation rebound," one must know something about the "progestational steroids." These are medical compounds containing synthetic progesterone, usually given in the form of pills. The best known are enovid and norlutin. One of the effects of these pills is to prevent ovulation, the passing of an ovum from a woman's ovaries into the fallopian tubes, which normally takes place every twenty-eighth day, about midway between periods of menstruation. If a woman takes a pill daily from the fifth to the twenty-fifth day of her menstrual cycle, she can hold up ovulation indefinitely. And, of course, where there is no ovulation there can be no conception.

As to the moral aspect of the use of these pills, the following rules seem to follow from the principles of theology, and are admitted by competent theologians who have written on this subject, such as Fr. J. Lynch, S.J. (*Linacre Quarterly,* August, 1958, 93-98; *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Theological Society of America,* 1958, 127-39) and Fr. T. O'Donnell, S.J. (*Morals in Medicine,* 1959, 272-74): (1) If these pills are taken for the direct and exclusive purpose of producing temporary sterility, their use is immoral, because the direct purpose is contraceptive. (2) If the pills are used for the direct purpose of providing a remedy for some serious pathological condition, such as abnormal menstrual bleeding, then their use is morally permissible. In such a case the sterility that might follow as a by-product could be justified by the principle of the double effect. It should be noted, however, that if the physical benefit can be procured by the use of the pills in such a way that ovulation will not normally be prevented (that is, from the fifteenth to the twenty-fifth day of the cycle), their use must be limited to this briefer period. For, the inducing of sterility even as an indirect effect is permissible only in the supposition that another procedure which will not produce the bad effect, is not reasonably available. (3) If the pills are used for the purpose of making a woman's periods regular, they are also morally permissible. For, everyone has the right to be normal. For example, if a woman's menstrual

period varies from 20 to 40 days, she may use these progestational steroids in order to have it happen every twenty-eight days. I have heard that the use of the pills for this purpose is not very successful, but I am here concerned only with its moral aspect. Even if a couple wish to attain regularity of menstruation so that they may practice Rhythm in order to avoid conception, they are allowed to use the pills, provided they have sufficient justification for the use of Rhythm.

Let us consider now the particular case with which our questioner is concerned—the use of progestational steroids for the purpose of "ovulational rebound." This has reference to a woman who is apparently sterile, unable to bear a child, although she ovulates normally. Some doctors believe that if, by the use of the pills, ovulation is totally suppressed over a period of several months, she has a very good chance of becoming pregnant when the medicine is withdrawn.

What is to be said of the morality of this procedure? Perhaps some may object to it on the score that it consists of the use of a bad means (temporary sterilization) to a good end (the achievement of pregnancy). However, I believe that the employment of "ovulation rebound" is morally justifiable. For, as Fr. Lynch points out in the *Linacre Quarterly* (*loc. cit.*), there can be two ways in which these pills may bring about the desired result. One explanation is this: The woman is suffering from undiagnosed endometriosis (an affliction of the womb which is a notable cause of infertility), and the pills directly control this condition. If this be the case, there is no moral difficulty, since the curative effect directly produced compensates for the other effect, the temporary suppression of ovulation.

The other explanation distinguishes between the suppression of ovulation and sterility, regarding the former (the suppression of ovulation) as something not intrinsically wrong, but rather as a quasi-mutilation, which can be justified (on the principle of totality) when normal ovulation is harmful to the welfare of the whole body (by producing infertility). By the principle of totality we mean that it is lawful to sacrifice a part of the body for the benefit of the whole. In this event, the temporary suppression of ovulation may be directly intended and produced by the use of the pills. Then the temporary sterility, the undesired effect of the process,

may be permitted (on the principle of the double effect) because of the desired good effect (the probability of attaining pregnancy). I believe that in this explanation the use of progestational steroids is permissible in the same way that it is permissible to excise (or to irradiate) a woman's healthy ovaries for the purpose of checking a cancerous condition of the breasts. In both cases there is an application of both the principle of totality and of the principle of the double effect.

In any event, priests can tell conscientious Catholic doctors, who may wish to help a woman achieve pregnancy by the method of "ovulation rebound" that they are not thereby violating the law of God. It is interesting to note also that, as Fr. O'Donnell points out (*op. cit.*, 145-46) rebound therapy, through the use of testosterone, is possible (and justifiable) in the attempt to render a man capable of generating.

THE ACT OF CONTRITION IN THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM

Question: I note that in the revised Baltimore Catechism the act of contrition omits the phrase "because I dread the loss of heaven and the pains of hell," contained in the former edition, and substitutes "because of thy just punishments." Is not this substitution contrary to the admonition of Pope Pius XII not to mitigate or to suppress the Catholic doctrine of the existence and the eternity of hell?

Answer: The change of wording in the revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism noted by our questioner was not intended as a means of mitigating or suppressing the Catholic doctrine of eternal punishment in hell. This doctrine is clearly stated in the answers to Questions 179, 183 and 185 of Catechism no. 2, and developed in greater detail in the corresponding answers in Catechism no. 3. The reason for the change in the wording of the act of contrition is this: The formula in the act of contrition is meant for all penitents, both those with mortal sin and those with only venial sin. It is desirable that the act contain motives for both perfect and imperfect contrition suitable for all. The former Catechism expressed *perfect* contrition in a way that was applicable to both mortal and venial sins—"because I have offended Thee, my

God, who are so good and deserving of all my love." Hence, the same formula has been retained in the new edition, with a slight change in the wording—"because they (my sins) offend Thee, etc." However, the expression of *imperfect* contrition (based on fear) in the former edition did not apply to one who had committed only venial sins, because he could not correctly say that he dreaded "the loss of heaven and the pains of hell." The only punishment he could fear would be temporal punishment in the present life or in purgatory. Hence, in the revised edition a wider motive is expressed, applicable to those who have only venial sins as well as to those who have mortal sins—"because of thy just punishments." This can refer both to the eternal punishment in hell as well as to the temporal punishment meted out in purgatory or in the present life for venial sins.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

JESUS CHRISTUS, MEDITATIONS. By Romano Guardini. Translated from the German by Peter White. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1959. Pp. 111. $2.75.

In this short work the renowned theologian presents a skein of thirteen meditative sermons. They were first delivered to the students at Berlin University during the period when Msgr. Guardini was preparing his monumental book, *The Lord.*

A kinship exists between the books. Somewhat like the affinity between a be-jeweled golden sermon for the special occasion, which, now epitomized for the crowded Sunday-morning Mass, still retains nuggety properties. The present work is not "a connected discourse on the Being of Christ" (p. 27). And yet, His Personality shines through it. The author attempts "to penetrate to the image of His figure in life; to look at it a number of times over, first from one viewpoint, then from another, in order to examine each trait separately, and to bring them together in a synthesis in the hope that we will find the essential reality like a gift that has been given to us" (p. 28).

Surprising penetrations into the mystery of the Lord await the reader who awakens to gossamer threads in the familiar Gospel fabric framing the core of the mystery. Insights revolving about the mother of Jesus, His passage through the world, His failure by earthly standards, His impact upon others through authority and through healing, bring one to the core of the mystery of Jesus, the God-Man.

In the considerations on Christ's unity with His Father, our own pedagogue does not keep his basic authority and companion veiled. It is through the pages of St. John's Gospel that we are to be led, now by the combined reflections upon the mystery of faith from two disciples who have grown old in the contemplation of Jesus' love. John's Gospel is the key to the understanding of the inner Jesus: "It is also the key to the whole New Testament. . . . To hear the decisive word on what sort of man Jesus was, one must turn to John. . . . He has the last word to say on the Master" (p. 66, 76, 77).

Strangely, one might suspect that everything could have been said in *The Lord.* Yet did St. John say all in his Gospel? Was it not in his first short epistle that he declared: "God is love"? *Jesus Christus* is a short echo of the timeless message from the "beloved disciple."

T. T. MIERZWINSKI

THE GENERAL COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. By John L. Murphy. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960. Pp. xii + 193. $3.50.

Announcement of the forthcoming Ecumenical council has heightened public interest, not only as to the place, time, agenda, etc., of the proposed council, but as to the essence, purpose, and effects of a general council as such. To answer such basic questions in a volume directed largely towards a lay reading audience is not an easy task. Realizing this and also keenly aware of the gradual development of the theology of the councils, Fr. Murphy has chosen something of an historico-inductive approach. By briefly examining each of the previous councils in its own historical and theological context, he has found the key to an intelligent, balanced and yet very readable presentation. As he expresses it: "What we have tried to do is take a quick glance at the various Councils, and outline, in some way, their place in the history of the Church" (p. vii). So long as one reads this book with the author's purpose in mind and remembers that, by reason of its proposed audience, it is not intended to be an exhaustive treatise on conciliar theology, he will agree, we believe, that Fr. Murphy has effectively achieved his end.

Without attempting to summarize the book, certain high points deserve mention. In Chapter One he clearly states the all important point of the basic difference in outlook between the believer (who sees the mystery of the Church from the vantage point of faith, i.e., "from within") and the unbeliever (who must necessarily view the Church "from without" and who can, therefore, never really grasp more than its external shell). The latter can hardly understand the true significance of a general council or perceive that the Holy Spirit works therein in a very real manner. Much less would he recognize the hand of Providence and workings of grace in circumstances that are, naturally speaking, often unfavorable. Yet so it has been in the past and so it will be again. A careful reading of this book should remind the believer once again that God has chosen to use "vessels of clay" as his instruments, with all their limitations and imperfections, and that his Mystical Body was formed upon such men and of such men. Fr. Murphy's survey of the twenty Councils brings out this theme and repeatedly highlights the ever-present guidance of the Holy Spirit. This and this alone can account for their special force in the twenty century history of the Church. In spite of great differences in time, place and circumstances, all have this in common; that is, each is a manifestation of the Holy Spirit in a special way. Fr. Murphy draws freely from the related theological issues and controversies which led to each of the councils. He is to be commended for his ability to portray

the continuity of theological debate and development and the close relationship between heresy, orthodox reaction, and conciliar definition.

He has brought out this process of the gradual development of theological understanding in his rapid but accurate treatment of the Trinitarian and Christological heresies and their relationship to the early Councils. Pursuing much the same approach with each of the other Councils, Fr. Murphy subtly increases one's appreciation of the role of the Holy Spirit and the necessary guidance of an infallible magisterium. He has succeeded in giving that long range over-all view, as necessary as it is elusive for an understanding of the history and theology of the Church. Surely this work will be of value to the interested layman as well as to the seminarian or priest.

JOHN FRANCIS WIPPEL

IN THE WHOLE CHRIST. By the Most Reverend Emile Guerry. Translated by M. G. Carroll. London: St. Paul Publications, 1957. Pp. xix + 331.

The most constant plea of every dogma professor is that the student not only grasp the truths of our Holy Faith intellectually, but also make them a more vital part of his spiritual life. Every student wonders how this is to be done. He knows the answer lies in fruitful meditations made faithfully every day. However, he is hard pressed to find a book of meditations which is a truly effective guide in this matter. Some are too affective, and do not present the dogmas scientifically enough; others are too sketchy; and still others do too much of the work, leaving very little for the "meditator" to do for himself.

Those who are familiar with Bishop Guerry's previous book, *God The Father* (Sheed and Ward, 1947), know that the problem of a completely adequate guide has been solved. There one finds a book which perfectly outlines Jesus' own devotion—that which He gave to the "Father, Who predestined us to be adopted through Jesus Christ as His sons. . . ." (*Eph.* 1:5). In those meditations, one comes to a truly clear and vital appreciation of our filial life in our relations with God the Father, such as that life has been revealed to us by Christ. The programme of making dogma real for our spiritual life and nourishment, so adequately begun in the first volume, is brilliantly carried forward in the second: *In The Whole Christ.*

The purpose of this book is to prepare for the reader's prayerful reflection a vivid and personal realization of the tremendous doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, and the place that the Church has in

his own life. It is the mystery of the union of Christians with Christ and in Christ that we are asked to contemplate in these pages: or as Paul puts it: ". . . there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, But Christ is all in all" (*Col.* 3:11). Obviously, since the mystery of the Mystical Body is the constant meditation of St. Paul, the Epistles of the great Apostle to the Gentiles figure prominently on almost every page. Here we may review—or rather see in a new light—the dogmatic tracts on Christ and His Church. This time, the manner of presentation is so personal, that the reader comes to an intimate knowledge of the part he must play in the working out of God's plan for the salvation of the world.

The book is divided into three parts. The first considers the Personal Christ, Head of the Mystical Body and Divine Source of all life. It treats of the mystery of the Person of Christ, considered in His greatness, His personal plenitude, His primacy, universal sovereignty and authority. In part two, the Whole Christ is depicted in His activity, revealing Himself to the soul. The Christian is shown how necessary it is to relinquish its more or less individualist conception of life, religion and destiny, in favor of that deeper and wider life where all of these are considered as linked in and through Christ to the whole of His Mystical Body, which mystery becomes then a living reality for the soul. The third part treats the mystery of the Catholic Church: its essence, general characteristics, transcendence; the mystery of its "marks"; the mystery of its hierarchy and sacramental order by which Christ communicates His life to men; the mystery of the Holy Spirit, ever active, giving to the Church that vitality by which souls are transformed into the image of Christ.

All three parts of this book give a wonderful theological presentation of the Christian life in Christ. If one should still wonder why he ought to obtain and use this book, I can do no better than to allow Bishop Guerry himself to supply the answer. In his introduction he says: "When one begins to relish the 'sweetness' of the Faith—as the Vatican Council so unerringly expresses it (Denz. 1791)—through a deeper penetration of its mysteries in the light and under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, one cannot agree to allow this sweetness to remain the privilege of a small *élite* of the learned. One regards it as a duty, especially if one is a priest, to communicate its benefits to all those souls, today so numerous, who, tired of a merely sentimental piety, are eager to know more intimately and more substantially the message of Christ and His Mystery."

MICHAEL J. CANTLEY

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC. By Paul van Kuykendall Thomson. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1959. Pp. 204. $2.75.

Before entering the Catholic Church, Paul van K. Thomson was not only a "born Protestant," but also for nine years a clergyman in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Thus he knows from personal experience that the Catholic Church is greatly misunderstood by non-Catholic America. He also knows that to achieve mutual understanding Catholics must make constructive contributions. *Why I Am a Catholic* is an effort to clear up some of the existing misunderstanding.

Only the first chapter is autobiographical; this book is not a convert story. It is a description of the Church in which, with a sense of home-coming, Mr. Thomson found "the fulfillment and the logical completion of many truths I first learned as a Protestant."

Mr. Thomson's description includes a glance at the organization of the Church which all the world sees, then at the foundation on which this rests—the divine institution of the Church. He outlines the history of the early Church and the medieval Church. He discusses the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ; he explains the Mass, Mary's unseverable connection with the Incarnation, the role of the saints in Catholic life, the interplay of revelation, faith and reason in Catholic doctrine, and many other subjects which a person curious about the Church would want to investigate.

The author does not offer new insights into these subjects, but he gives a clear and intelligent explanation of the Church to which God led him. The book betrays his wide reading and deep understanding of the Catholic Church. This is a convenient hand-book of the Church for both Catholic and non-Catholic.

ROBERT A. MIZE, C.S.P.

ANCHORED IN GOD. By Constantine Cavarnos. Astir Publishing Company, Athens, 1959. Pp. 230.

One wonders what it is that has aroused so much interest recently in Mount Athos. Is it simply our superficial curiosity about something "new" and different? Is it the current Christian ecumenism? Is there a real spiritual renascence? Or is there something of all three involved?

Athos is really a 35-mile long peninsula in northern Greece pointing southeastward into the Aegean Sea. The mountain is near the tip; it rises 6,400 feet out of the blue sea. There have been monks on Athos since St. Athanasios the Athonite founded the first monastery in 963.

Today there are some 2,000 in twenty monasteries and innumerable dependent "sketes" and "kellia." Athos has long been the center of Eastern Orthodox monasticism and spirituality.

A number of things especially move the visitor to the Holy Mountain: it is a place of rich natural beauty and primitive ruggedness; it has a peculiar architecture shaped by the terrain and the needs of defense; its churches and chapels and refectories are frescoed interiorly with the highly spiritual iconography of the Eastern Christian Church; it is finally a fortress of asceticism, mysticism and sanctity.

Having been able to read or at least page through most of the current literature on Athos, I might venture the opinion that *Anchored in God* is the best real portrayal of the Holy Mountain that we have. The book is the work of an American of Hellenic ancestry who has the inestimable advantage of speaking modern Greek. Dr. Cavarnos took his doctorate in philosophy at Harvard, and has taught that subject there and at the University of North Carolina. More immediate to this study, he made three trips to Athos, one as a Fulbright Research Scholar in Modern Greek Thought at the University of Athens.

The subtitle of Dr. Cavarnos' book gives an indication of its scope: "Life, Art, and Thought on the Holy Mountain." The book is perfectly straightforward and unequivocal. It is more a report than an interpretation. For the traveller to the Holy Mountain, *Anchored in God* provides the necessary information on how to get there and how to get around by boat or donkey or foot once one is there, and what to expect at the monastery guest houses. The author simply records his experiences. He takes us from Salonica to Athos and then from monastery to monastery or skete. Each chapter deals with a different establishment.

At each monastery or skete or kelli the author notes certain things about its rule, its members, its building. His recorded conversations with monks and hermits cover everything from iconography to philosophy to asceticism and spirituality. One learns about Byzantine art and artists from the great Manuel Panselinos through the Cretan and Macedonian schools up to the Italian Renaissance-influenced paintings of the past century. Speaking of the frescoes of the Church of the Protaton in Karyes, the capitol of the Holy Mountain, he says: "These representations of sacred persons and incidents are not naturalistic, as some have asserted; nor are they products of man's arbitrary imagination. They are the forms of new, transfigured men, impressed upon matter by an artist who succeeded in rising above the realm of nature and the realm of the imagination to that of the spirit."

The author is persistent in seeking the Eastern way of spirituality. He asks Joseph, a hermit of New Skete, and the spiritual father and guide of eight monks, about this way: " 'Don't neglect prayer,' he went on. 'Practice especially mental prayer, or prayer of the heart,' saying: 'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me.' This is the most important form of spiritual work. . . . Set aside an hour each day, preferably in the evening before going to bed, and practice it continuously during that time. . . . 'Of all forms of prayer,' said Joseph, 'this is the safest and best, provided it is combined with inner attention, so that the mind does not wander off, and that one follows the instructions of an experienced spiritual guide.' "

The author's informants lay great stress on the spiritual guide. Two textbooks of the spiritual life are recommended over and over again: *Evergetinos* (an English translation, *The Way of a Pilgrim*, has appeared), which is a preparation for the *Philokalia* (parts of which have appeared in English under the titles *Writings from the Philokalia on Prayer of the Heart* and *Early Fathers from the Philokalia*.)

This spiritual adventure is supported by a deeply ascetical life of fasting, watching during long night hours of prayer, numerous daily prostrations, and the like. Much more could be reported about this excellent guide; my one criticism is that the author has on a few occasions (explaining, for example, the reasons for incensing the people during the Church services) fallen prey to merely functional and psychological explanations.

A final comment. The book is illustrated with excellent black and white photographs and with pen sketches by Fotis Kontoglous and Rallis Kopsidis which are not only charming in their simplicity but give an excellent insight of the Holy Mountain.

THOMAS PHELAN

HARVEST, 1960: A Selection of the Best Articles from the Catholic Press Published During the Past Years. Edited by Dan Herr and Paul Cuneo. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960. Pp. xiv + 289. $3.50.

This is a collection of thirty contributions culled from the past year's issues of Catholic periodicals and of one magazine that used to describe itself as "not a Catholic paper but a paper run by Catholics." Many of these essays are quite interesting. Still, taken as a unit, the book unfortunately leaves the impression that, if the editors' claim that this volume actually contains "A Selection of the Best Articles

from the Catholic Press Published during the Past Year" is in any way justified, then 1959 was definitely not a vintage year for Catholic periodical writing.

Older readers will, I think, be struck by the evidence of the continuity of certain themes in Catholic papers and magazines over the course of the past four decades. Four of these themes are treated in *Harvest, 1960*.

For the past few decades we seem always to have had with us, and *Harvest, 1960* shows that we still have with us, the visiting English Catholic lecturer who is prevailed upon to instruct us poor American Catholics about our cultural status or lack of it. *Harvest, 1960* brings us the contributions of two of these imports. Like their innumerable dreary predecessors, Messrs. Christopher Dawson and Norman St. John-Stevas are at pains to inform us that our condition, though deplorable, is not necessarily hopeless.

And, of course, we still have with us the article on "Science and the Church"; and also the intimate glimpse into the life of a recent Pope. Both of these *loci communes* are treated rather well in the present volume.

Finally there is the hardiest of all the perennials in the none-too-well-kept garden of Catholic periodical literature. This is the assurance, given by the customary obscurantist liberal Catholic, that the Church can and should make itself quite at home in the modern structure of society. *Harvest, 1960* brings us such assurance in the text of a rather stuffy commencement address delivered by Mr. Cogley.

The idea behind *Harvest, 1960* was a good one. It is to be hoped that *Harvest, 1961* will be a better book.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

Books Received

THE SECRET OF DREAMS. By Pedro Meseguer, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. viii + 232. $4.75.

READINGS IN CHURCH HISTORY: Volume I: FROM PENTECOST TO THE PROTESTANT REVOLT. Edited by Colman J. Barry, O.S.B. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xx + 633. $7.50 (cloth); $2.95 (paper).

THE BIBLE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE. By Bertram Hessler. Translated by Sylvester Saller. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1960. Pp. xiii + 87. $1.75.

TO THE LEAST. By Wendelin Meyer, O.F.M. Translated by Herman J. Fister, O.F.M. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1960. Pp. x + 85. 95¢.

VICO NECCHI: A BIOGRAPHY. By Nesta de Robeck. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1960. Pp. 163. $2.95.

LE CLERGÉ DIOCÉSAIN. By A. M. Charue. Tournai: Desclée, 1960. Pp. 320. No price given.

THE BOOK OF NUMBERS. Part I. Commentary by Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. Pp. 96. 75¢.

THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH FOR SALVATION IN SELECTED THEOLOGICAL WRITINGS OF THE PAST CENTURY. By John J. King, O.M.I. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. xxvii + 363. $6.00.

VERS UNE HAUTE PERFECTION. By Germain Lesage, O.M.I. Ottawa: Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1960. Pp. 192. No price given.

ORIENTAZIONI METAFISICHE. By Aimé Forest. Milano: Marzorati. 1960. Pp. 139. No price given.

THE RULE FOR NUNS OF ST. CAESARIUS OF ARLES: A Translation with a Critical Introduction. By Mother Maria Caritas McCarthy, S.N.C.J. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. viii + 230. $3.75.

THE MYSTERY OF DIVINE MERCY. By Hyacinth Wornieki, O.P. Stockbridge, Mass.: Marian Fathers, 1960. Pp. v + 129. $1.75 (paper); $2.50 (cloth).

GOD'S INFINITE MERCY. By Julian Chrosciechowski, M.I.C. Stockbridge, Mass.: Marian Fathers, 1960. Pp. 140. $2.00 (paper); $2.75 (cloth).

VINCENT DE PAUL, SAINT OF CHARITY. By Margaret Ann Hubbard. New York: Vision Books, 1960. Pp. 190. $1.95.

FRANCES WARDE AND THE FIRST SISTERS OF MERCY. By Sister Marie Christopher, R.S.M. New York: Vision Books, 1960. Pp. 190. $1.95.

MANUAL FOR FORTY HOURS. New Edition, Edited by Walter J. Schmitz, S.S. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. 47. 60¢.

STATUTES OF THE ARCHEPARCHY OF PHILADELPHIA. Enacted and promulgated by the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, S.T.D. Philadelphia: Metropolitan Chancery, 815 No. Franklin Street, 1960. Pp. xxiii + 234.

SOUL AND PSYCHE. By Victor White. New York: Harper, 1960. Pp. 312. $5.00.

THE CHRISTIAN TODAY. By Jean Danielou, S.J. Translated by Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J. New York: Desclee, 1960. Pp. 150. $2.75.

PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION. By Thomas C. Campanelle. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1960. Pp. ix + 278. No price given.

FUNDAMENTALS OF THE LITURGY. By John H. Miller, C.S.C. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides, 1960. Pp. xviii + 531. $6.00.

GUIDE TO THE BIBLE. Volume I. By A. Robert and A. Tricot. Translated by Edward P. Arbez, S.S. and Martin R. P. McGuire. New York: Desclee, 1960. Pp. xxvi + 812. $8.00.